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## Frameworks

## Advantages

### Advantage: Soft Power

Soft power on the brink of collapse.

Dodgson December 3, 2015

Theo Cox Dodgson. A Level Impacts. The US is Not a Power Decline. <http://alevelpolitics.com/the-us-is-not-a-power-in-decline/>

However **American values are** still **dominant in** the **global institutions** which it has influence over. The IMF are still keen to promote economic liberalism- with $900 million being lent to Ghana in February 2015 on the condition it liberalize it’s petroleum sector and in July 2015 it helped bail out Greece on the condition it implement harsh spending cuts. In 2005 the UN established the United Nations Democracy Fund, of which George Bush was a founding member, which grants large sums of money every year to small projects promoting democracy, in 2010 it was endowed with $100 million for this purpose. The aforementioned intellectual discontent has not yet reached the upper echelons of the named global governing institutions in which America and the things she stands for still has the greatest amount of influence. In conclusion American hard power and **American soft power is** still **secure for now**, and so is the supremacy of American values. Thus the US, based on these factors, is not yet in decline. However it is clear that these **factors which make up American power are under** visible **threat**, both physically (China) and **ideologically (enemies within**). **Unless steps** to counteract these two threats **are taken soon ,** **it may** well soon **find itself in terminal decline**.

**Gun violence hurts soft power – it’s try or die not taking an action just makes it worse.**

**Freedland 2013:**

**J**onathan (the Guardian's executive editor) “Washington DC shootings: America's gun disease diminishes its soft power” The Guardian September 17th 2013 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/17/washington-dc-shootings-america-gun-disease>

That ranges from its ability to project military force across the globe to its attractiveness, its"soft power". For decades, this latter quality has been seen as one of the US's primary assets, central to its ability to lead and persuade other nations. But **America's gun disease diminishes its soft power**. **It makes the country seem less like a model and more like a basket case,** afflicted by a pathologyother nations strive to avoid. **When** similar **gun massacres** have **struck elsewhere** – including in Britain – **lawmakers** have **acted** swiftly to tighten controls, watching as the gun crime statistics then fell. In the [decade after the rules were toughened in Australia](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/08/02/did-gun-control-work-in-australia/) in 1996, for example, firearm-related homicides fell by 59%, while suicides involving guns fell by 65%. But the US stays stubbornly where it is, refusing to act. When President Obama last tried, following the deaths of 20 children and six staff at Sandy Hook at the end of 2012, his bill fell at the first senate hurdle. He had not proposed banning a single weapon or bullet – merely expanding the background checks required of someone wanting to buy a gun. But even that was too much. The national security pundits who worry how **a US president** is perceived when he is incapable of protecting the lives of innocent Syrians abroad should think how it looks when he **is incapable of protecting** the lives of **innocent Americans** at home**.** **On guns, the** **US** – so often the world leader in innovation and endeavour – **is** the laggard, stuck **at the bottom** of the global class. [Bill Clinton perfectly distilled the essence of soft power](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/aug/28/uselections2008.democrats20085) when he said in 2008, "People the world over have always been more impressed by the power of our example than by the example of our power." He was right. But **every time a disturbed** or angry **individual is able to vent** his rage with an assault weapon, killing innocents with ease, **the power of America**'s example **fades a little more**.

**The link is perception – I don’t need to win that I reduce gun violence to access the terminal impact.**

James Winkates 07 (Research Professor at International Affairs Air War College) "Soft Power Contributions to U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, CHICAGO, IL, USA, Feb 28, 2007 <http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p181547_index.html>

14 So the concept and employment of soft power has become increasingly universalized. External perceptions of policy legitimacy directly enhance a nation’s soft power. Because of domestic and foreign policy choices made by the U.S. government and even private business, America starts out disadvantaged in terms of perceived illegitimacy. The cutting difference is not the “rightness” or “wrongness” of the policy choices; rather it is that U.S. public and private decision selections are often at variance with the larger international community. National policy on capital punishment and gun ownership, for example, put America in a minority of governments on those issues.

**Soft power solves multiple scenarios for extinction. Nye[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**t power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. If a people or nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead without using threats and bribes. Legitimacy can** also **reduce opposition to—and the costs of—**using **hard power when the situation demands. Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely** to arise without warning. **The threat of widespread physical harm to the planet posed by nuclear catastrophe has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases. The potential security challenges posed by climate change raise[s] the possibility of an entirely new set of threats for the United States to consider… States and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those who alienate** potential **friends** will **stand at greater risk.**

### Advantage: Economy

The US economy is on the brink of collapse.

Hayes January 7, 2016:

Adam Hayes January 7, 2016 (6 Factors That Point to Global Recession in 2016. Investopedia. <http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/071515/6-factors-point-global-recession-2016.asp>)

Economic Data Shows Patterns Similar to Right Before the Last Recession Aside from the "stories" unfolding in the global economy above, some finer economic data is beginning to show some eerily similar patterns that have predicted recessions in the past: - **Retail Sales have [dropped](http://www.zerohedge.com/sites/default/files/images/user3303/imageroot/2015/04/20150415_recess3.jpg" \t "_blank)** the most since before the last recession. The same is true with wholesale [sales](http://www.zerohedge.com/sites/default/files/images/user3303/imageroot/2015/04/20150415_recess2.jpg" \t "_blank). - **U.S. factory orders have [dropped](http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-04-24/8-charts-prove-us-already-recession" \t "_blank)** the most since the collapse of Lehman Brothers. - **Real** U.S. **GDP growth has begun to [decline](http://www.bea.gov/newsreleases/national/gdp/gdpnewsrelease.htm" \t "_blank)**, turning slightly negative last quarter. - **U.S. export growth has been [weakening](https://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/series/XTEXVA01USM657S" \t "_blank).** - Corporate profits are beginning to [decline](http://theeconomiccollapseblog.com/archives/a-recession-within-a-recession" \t "_blank). The Bottom Line **We may be on the verge of another global recession.** Patterns in **economic data are showing** signs of **weakness**, and the troubles persisting in Europe or the bubble bursting in China may be the trigger that sends the economy over the edge.

Gun violence hurts the economy.

Goldman[[2]](#footnote-2) 2012:

**The cost of U.S. gun violence in work lost, medical care, insurance, criminal-justice expenses and pain** and suffering **amounted to** as much as **$174 billion** in 2010, according to data compiled by the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation in Calverton, Maryland. The nonprofit organization provides cost estimates of illnesses and injuries for the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the U.S. Transportation Department and industry associations, said economist Ted Miller, the group’s principal research scientist. Columbine Massacre The institute placed the cost of gun violence as higher than the total for U.S. alcohol-related automobile crashes**,** which was calculated at $129.7 billion in a 2006 study conducted for the road-construction industry, he said. The societal **cost of just** **one** gun **homicide averages $5 million**, according to the institute. That includes **$1.6 million in lost work; $29,000 in medical care**; **$11,000 on surviving families’ mental-health treatment; $397,000 in criminal-justice,** incarceration and police expenses; **$9,000 in employer losses; and $3 million in** pain, suffering and **lost quality of life**. Miller’s gun-injury cost estimate may be the highest of several conducted in the years since the April 20, 1999, Columbine High School massacre, when two seniors killed 12 fellow students and a teacher, and injured 21. Economic Toll In 2002, two public-policy professors -- Philip Cook of Duke University and Jens Ludwig from Georgetown University -- published “Gun Violence: The Real Costs,” based on research begun in the late 1990s. It calculated the costs to be at least $100 billion. “It’s an economic cost in that it’s a reduction in the standard of living and quality of life in the same way that having dirty air or traffic congestion can be translated into an economic cost,” Cook said in a telephone interview. Miller’s institute prepared its cost estimates based on 2010 CDC data, the most recent available. The agency reported 105,177 shootings resulting in injury in 2010. Of those, 31,672 died by homicide, suicide, law-enforcement action or accident; 38,566 survived after hospital stays; and 34,939 were treated and released from emergency rooms. It derived its numbers by using formulas established by economic models often used by courts, and reports of government agencies and hospitals, Miller said in a phone interview. ‘Large Problem’ The U.S. Health and Human Services Department supplied total and average costs of shooting-related hospital stays, Miller said. The group estimates the cost of lost work -- even uncompensated household chores -- and future earnings with data from the Labor Department and Census Bureau, Miller said. Dividing the $174 billion total by the number of guns in the U.S. -- 270 million as reported by the United Nations’ International Small Arms Survey -- the institute calculated **the cost** to society **of each civilian-owned firearm in the U.S. at more than $644.**

**That causes massive amounts of crime and lots of bad impacts.**

CPC 1996

(The Root Causes of Crime. CS and CPC. <http://preventingcrime.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Causes_of_Crime.pdf>)

Individuals need to be responsible for their own actions. An understanding of root causes cannot and should not be seen as a way to absolve us from personal accountability. However, while individuals have an obligation to act responsibly and with respect for their fellow citizens, communities have a responsibility to address those conditions, which hinder healthy development and can become the breeding ground for rime. The root causes of crime are well documented and researched. **Crime is** primarily **the outcome of** multiple **adverse** social, **economic**, cultural and family **conditions**. To prevent crime it is important to have an understanding of its roots. These are complex and interrelated, but can be summarized in three main categories: • Economic Factors/Poverty • Social Environment • Family Structures Economic Factors/Poverty **In addition to lack of financial resources, poverty manifests itself in a lack of education**alopportunities**, lack of** meaningful **employment** options**, poor housing,** lack of hope **and** the **prejudice against** persons living in **poverty**

### Advantage: Cartels

US guns fuel Mexican cartel violence.

McDougal et al 2013:

**Tohper McDougal,Robert Muggah, Daivd shirk, John Patterson March 18, 2013**

**(Made in the USA: The Role of American Guns in Mexican Violence. The Atlantic.** [**http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/03/made-in-the-usa-the-role-of-american-guns-in-mexican-violence/274103/**](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/03/made-in-the-usa-the-role-of-american-guns-in-mexican-violence/274103/)**)**

As many as **120,000 people in Mexico have been murdered** since 2006, many from a bullet to the back of the head. Most of **these killings are committed not with assault rifles, but** rather **pistols and revolvers**. **Many are perpetrated by** hit-men tied to **narco-cartels**, but some occur in confrontations with soldiers and police. What's more, the majority of **guns** causing mayhem on Mexico's streets **are made in the U**nited **S**tates. And for all their destructive power, no one seems to know just how many firearms are flowing into the country. Mexico can hardly be described as a heavily armed society. With around 2.5 million registered gun owners and at least 13 million more illegal arms in circulation, the country has a ratio of just 15 guns for every 100 people, well below the global average. Unlike in the U.S., civilian possession in Mexico is considered a privilege, not a right and is tightly regulated under federal law since the 1970s. Extensive background checks are required of all purchasers, and there are heavy penalties and even imprisonment for non-compliance. Astonishingly, **there is just one legal gun shop in the country**, compared to more than 54,000 federally licensed firearm dealers and thousands of pawnshops and gun shows scattered across the U.S. Yet in spite of tough gun laws in Mexico, the proportion of killings committed with firearms skyrocketed from around 20 percent in the mid-1990s to 50 percent in the past few years. What explains the sudden rise in gun violence? A big part of the problem resides not in Mexico, but in the U.S. In an economic study conducted by the University of San Diego's Trans-Border Institute and the Brazil-based Igarapé Institute, we estimated the volume of firearms annually trafficked across the US-Mexico border. Drawing on data from the Bureau for Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, we hypothesized that if the volume of the trade was significant, it would contribute to the total demand for firearms (and retailers) near the U.S.-Mexico border. We conservatively estimate that about 2.2 percent of total demand for U.S.-sold firearms originated south of the border between 2010 and 2012. These weapons are often bought in the U.S. through "straw man" purchases, who acquire arms on behalf of others with the intention of being trafficked to Mexico. This translates into at least $127 million dollars in revenue for gun retailers and weapons manufacturers who are literally making a killing. More importantly, it is the equivalent of an annual average of **252,000 guns cross**ing **the border**, far above previous estimates based on seizure data. In other words, the roughly 37,000 guns seized at the border by U.S. and Mexican authorities in 2009 probably represents less than 15 per cent of total traffic. What this means is that **the U.S. is a** significant**,** albeit unintentional, **contributor to the** global **black market in arms** and ammunition in Mexico.

Empirics prove that relaxed US regulation causes cartel gun proliferation. Dube 13:

American Political Science Review Vol. 107, No. 3 August 2013 doi:10.1017/S0003055413000178 c American Political Science Association 2013 Cross-Border Spillover: U.S. Gun Laws and Violence in Mexico ARINDRAJIT DUBE University of Massachusetts Amherst OEINDRILA DUBE New York University OMAR GARC´IA-PONCE New York University

We find that the reach of U.S. gun laws extends beyond its borders. Our analysis shows that the **expiration of the U.S. FAWB** **led to immediate violence increases** **within** areas of **Mexico** located close to American states where sales of assault weapons became legal. The estimated effects are sizable, and unrelated to the idiosyncratic influence of specific border states, trends in socioeconomic conditions, legal enforcement patterns, and drug-trafficking along the border. The baseline estimates suggest that municipios **neighboring** entry **ports** into Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico **saw total homicides rise by 60%** as compared to municipios 100 miles away. This implies an additional 238 homicides in the area within 100 miles of the border, in each of the two years after the 2004 policy change. To put the size of the effect into perspective, the additional homicides stemming from the FAWB expiration represent 21% of all homicides in these municipios during 2005 and 2006. Similarly, the **additional gun related homicides represent 30% of all such deaths** over this period. Our findings also demonstrate that political competition plays an important role in determining the impact of gun access on violence: estimated homicide increases were greater in municipios with a larger number of effective political parties contesting elections, and these **differentials were more pronounced in** high **drug trafficking areas**. These results are consistent with the notion that increased competition associated with Mexico’s democratic transition disrupted implicit agreements between DTOs and the long-ruling PRI, which had previously enabled drug cartels to operate with relative impunity in particular municipalities. They also suggest that political institutions help forge relationships between the state and nonstate actors such as drug cartels, which ultimately shape the industrial organization of crime. Our analysis of the 2002–2006 period holds the policy implication that **stricter control of guns in the U.S. could** help **curb** rising **violence in Mexico**, particularly over the long run.

Drug trade violence collapses Mexico and destabilizes the US

Broder, 9senior editor for defense and foreign policy at Roll Call. Before joining Congressional Quarterly in 2002, he worked as an editor at National Public Radio in Washington and as a foreign correspondent for the Associated Press, NBC News and the Chicago Tribune, based in Jerusalem, Beirut and Beijing. graduate of the University of Virginia and studied international relations at Harvard University. (Jonathan, “Mexico's Drug War: Violence Too Close to Home” 3/9/09 http://library.cqpress.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/cqweekly/weeklyreport111-000003069323.) // czhang

Retired Gen. Barry McCaffrey, who was the Drug czar in the Clinton White House, warned recently that unless the Mexican government gains control of the Drug gangs, the United States could, within a decade, be confronting on its southern border a “narco-state” — meaning an area controlled by Drug cartels. The Pentagon envisions an even worse scenario: Mexico and Pakistan, it says, are the countries most at risk of swiftly collapsing into “failed states” — those whose central governments are so weak they have little practical control over most of their territory.¶ Beset as he is at home by the credit crisis and plunging economy, President Obama’s response to the chaos in Mexico has so far been to continue some George W. Bush administration policies while beginning a search for others. He is expected to focus on possible regional approaches when he attends a Summit of the Americas in Trinidad and Tobago next month.¶ Experts on the region, though, say the magnitude of the Drug war in Mexico and its danger to the United States far exceed the reach of existing federal policies, perhaps even the policies the new administration is considering, such as stepped-up military aid and regional cooperation.¶ Uncontrolled Drug violence in Mexico, these experts say, might result in tens of thousands of refugees surging across the border**,** adding to the estimated 12 million immigrants already in the country illegally. U.S. Drug officials say that a narco-state in Mexico could turn the ungoverned territory along the border into a permanent springboard for Mexican Drug traffickers smuggling their goods north into California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas. And economic analysts say that should the Mexican government completely collapse, it would jeopardize oil exports from Mexico, from which the United States receives a third of its supply.¶ “Any descent by Mexico into chaos,” the Pentagon’s Joint Forces Command wrote in November, “would demand an American response based on the serious implications for homeland security alone.”

**Collapses hegemony – US attention will be too focused on Mexico to deal with international issues**

Haddick 8 - a contractor at U.S. Special Operations Command who wrote the “This Week at War” column for Foreign Policy - (Robert, “Now that would change everything” December 2008, http://westhawk.blogspot.com/2008/12/now-that-would-change-everything.html)//WL

How that internal conflict turns out over the next several years will have a major impact on the stability of the Mexican state. Any descent by the Mexico into chaos would demand an American response based on the serious implications for homeland security alone. Yes, the “rapid collapse” of Mexico would change everything with respect to the global security environment. Such a collapse would have enormous humanitarian, constitutional, economic, cultural, and security implications for the U.S. It would seem the U.S. federal government, indeed American society at large, would have little ability to focus serious attention on much else in the world. The hypothetical collapse of Pakistan is a scenario that has already been well discussed. In the worst case, the U.S. would be able to isolate itself from most effects emanating from south Asia.

Heg solves multiple extinction scenarios.

Thayer 6 **Associate Prof, Department of Defense & Strategic Studies at Missouri State University**

[Bradley, In Defense of Primacy, The National Interest, December (lexis)November 10, 2006 http://nationalinterest.org/article/in-defense-of-primacy-1300, accessed June 29. 2011

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power--Rome, Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics. Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)." Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularly war's worst form: great power wars. Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.3 So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, **the likelihood of** any type of **conflict is** significantly **reduced**. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States. Critics have faulted the Bush Administration for attempting to spread democracy in the Middle East, labeling such an effort a modern form of tilting at windmills. It is the obligation of Bush's critics to explain why democracy is good enough for Western states but not for the rest, and, one gathers from the argument, should not even be attempted. Of course, whether democracy in the Middle East will have a peaceful or stabilizing influence on America's interests in the short run is open to question. Perhaps democratic Arab states would be more opposed to Israel, but nonetheless, their people would be better off. The United States has brought democracy to Afghanistan, where 8.5 million Afghans, 40 percent of them women, voted in a critical October 2004 election, even though remnant Taliban forces threatened them. The first free elections were held in Iraq in January 2005. It was the military power of the United States that put Iraq on the path to democracy. Washington fostered democratic governments in Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Caucasus. Now even the Middle East is increasingly democratic. They may not yet look like Western-style democracies, but democratic progress has been made in Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. By all accounts, the march of democracy has been impressive. Third, along with the growth in the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, and mobility of capital and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good from which all states benefit, particularly the poorest states in the Third World. The United States created this network not out of altruism but for the benefit and the economic well-being of America.

### Advantage: Small Arms

**Small arms are an incredibly pressing problem-proliferation is high now.**

**Ezrow January 4, 2016**

**Natasha Ezrow January 4, 2016**

**(5 Biggest Security Threat Facing the World in 2016. IFL Science.** [**http://www.iflscience.com/editors-blog/five-biggest-security-threats-facing-world-2016**](http://www.iflscience.com/editors-blog/five-biggest-security-threats-facing-world-2016)**)**

This is the [leading cause of death](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/06/murder-map-latin-america-leads-world-key-cities-buck-deadly-trend) for Brazilians between 15 and 29. 4: Small Arms **Small arms** and light weapons **are** still **an enormous problem,** whether in the hands of insurgent groups, terror networks, organised criminal groups, gangs or rogue citizens. One down… [Reuters/Jorge Lopez](http://pictures.reuters.com/C.aspx?VP3=SearchResult&VBID=2C0BXZZ1P9GSR&PN=5&IID=2C0BF1ORY0G_Y#/SearchResult&VBID=2C0BXZZ1P9GSR&PN=5&IID=2C0BF1ORY0G_Y&POPUPPN=241&POPUPIID=2C0BF1ORY0G_Y) This is hardly a threat confined to chronically insecure countries or those facing civil conflict. While readily accessible small arms have long posed a major threat to countries enduring civil wars (in Angola, an AK-47 [can be had for the same price as a chicken](https://books.google.com.eg/books?id=r-vbBAAAQBAJ&pg=PA15&lpg=PA15&dq=angola+ak+47+cost+chichen&source=bl&ots=EGb6btjNud&sig=Nz4nRK3w32oBR28gXQ2v-_x7sZ8&hl=ar&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwii2NPCiOHJAhVBTxoKHU0yBU8Q6AEIJzAB%23v=onepage&q=angola%2520ak%252047%2520cost%2520chichen&f=false)), the US continues to have terrible trouble confronting its longstanding problem with gun crime. **In the US** in 2015 **there were more than 50,000 injuries** sustained in domestic gun violence alone and 12,666 deaths <http://www.gunviolencearchive.org/> from gun violence overall. Mass shootings perpetrated by sufferers of mental illness have garnered media attention, but most deaths were not executed by the “mentally ill”. **Lax gun control laws** continue to **wreck havoc**, while some gun rights advocates still argue that more widespread gun ownership would make all Americans safer.

**Small arms incite African conflict and instability.**

**Oluwadare November 2, 2014:**

Col Abiodun Joseph Oluwadare (rtd), Ph.D. November 2, 2014

(The Impact of the Proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons on West African States: An Analysis of the Sierra Leone Civil War. Journal of studies in Social sciences. http://infinitypress.info/index.php/jsss/article/viewFile/694/319)

What is however incontrovertible is that the **arms transfers to Africa** were **not** **only** used to **escalate existing crisis,** **but also played** huge **roles** **in the initiation of** series of **conflicts**. At the internal level, **small arms** and light weapons **have become easily accessible** as a result of, among others, poor stockpile management, the corrupt act of state officials who participate in violating extant rules and the recirculation of existing stocks on the continent as a result of porous borders and the complicity of officials. However, the spate with which small arms and light weapons proliferate Africa and the destructive tendencies it engendered alarmed the international community and prompted efforts to stem the tide. For this purpose, the United Nations General Assembly provides a working definition thus: Any man-portable lethal weapon that expels or launches, is designed to expel or launch a shot, bullet or projectile by the action of an explosive, excluding antique small arms and light weapons or their replicas. Antique small arms and light weapons will be defined in accordance with domestic law. In no case will antique small arms and light weapons include those manufactured after 1899. Similarly, the ECOWAS Convention (2006) on the management and control of small arms and light weapons provides the following definition: All components, parts or spare parts for small arms or light weapons or ammunition necessary for its functioning; or any chemical substance serving as active material used as propelling or explosive agent. Indeed, the negative impact of the illicit proliferation of SALW on the political and socio-economic conditions requires no reiteration. The continued and permanent devastation caused by these weapons are constant reminders of the fragility of institutional mechanisms and structures for protection within African states. In reference to the West Africa scenario, Keili (2008) submits that: “SALW are extreme tools of violence in West Africa for several reasons. **Small arms are durable**, **highly portable**, easily concealed, simple to use, extremely lethal and possess legitimate military, police and civilian uses. In West Africa, these weapons are cheap and widely available; **they are also lightweight**, **and** so **can be used by** **child soldiers, who have played** such a **significant role in recent conflicts in West Africa”.** This scenario played out **in** the **Sierra Leone** civil war, where the proliferation of illicit **SALW** made possible through the assistance of neighbouring statesLiberia, Gabon, Burkina Faso, Cote d’Ivoire and Libya **ensured that the war lasted for** about **a decade**, and provided the post-war Sierra Leone with litters of SALW that have been used for banditry, gang-related crimes, political assassination, among others, and thus, a never-ending security dilemma.

**African conflict draws outside conflict and escalates to nuclear war and extinction.**

**Deutsch 02 –**

Founder of Rabid Tiger Project (Political Risk Consulting and Research Firm focusing on Russia and Eastern Europe) [Jeffrey, “SETTING THE STAGE FOR WORLD WAR III,” Rabid Tiger Newsletter, Nov 18, http://www.rabidtigers.com/rtn/newsletterv2n9.html]

The Rabid Tiger Project believes that a **nuclear war is most likely to start in Africa**. **Civil wars** in the Congo (the country formerly known as Zaire), Rwanda, Somalia and Sierra Leone, **and** **domestic instability** in Zimbabwe, Sudan and other countries, **as well as** **occasional brushfire** and other wars (thanks in part to "national" borders that cut across tribal ones) **turn into a really nasty stew**. We've got all too many rabid tigers and potential rabid tigers, who are willing to push the button rather than risk being seen as wishy-washy in the face of a mortal threat and overthrown. **Geopolitically speaking, Africa is open range**. **Very few countries** in Africa **are** **beholden to any particular power**. South Africa is a major exception in this respect - not to mention in that she also probably already has the Bomb. Thus, **outside powers can more easily find client states there** than, say, in Europe where the political lines have long since been drawn, or Asia where many of the countries (China, India, Japan) are powers unto themselves and don't need any "help," thank you. Thus, **an African war can attract outside involvement very quickly.** Of course, a proxy war alone may not induce the Great Powers to fight each other. But **an African nuclear strike can ignite a much broader conflagration**, **if the other powers are interested in a fight.** Certainly, such a strike would in the first place have been facilitated by outside help - financial, scientific, engineering, etc. Africa is an ocean of troubled waters, and some people love to go fishing.

#### The plan removes the NRA’s rationale for opposing the treaty

Akwei 12 (Adotei, Managing Director, Government Relations Amnesty International USA, “NRA Conducts a False Campaign Against the UN Arms Trade Treaty”, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/letters-to-the-editor/2012/07/12/nra-conducts-a-false-campaign-against-the-un-arms-trade-treaty-)

The U.S. gun lobby is once again falsely painting the critically important arms trade talks at the United Nations as an effort to undermine gun ownership in the United States ("NRA Takes Aim at Weapons Treaty" 7/9). Spreading such misinformation may help the National Rifle Association raise money and gain converts to its cause, but it has no basis in fact. Worse still, it gives credence to allegations that the NRA's attempt to make this treaty a Second Amendment issue is merely a front to conceal its true motive—to protect the lucrative weapons industry that bankrolls the organization and benefits immensely from current free-for-all in the global trade in weapons and ammunition.

#### That rationale is the same reason the Senate won’t ratify a small arms control agreement

Sargent 13 (Greg, 4/3, staff @ Wash Post, “The GOP and the black helicopter crowd”, https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/04/03/gop-takes-marching-orders-from-black-helicopter-crowd/)

If you want to understand why progress on gun violence or on other major issues facing the country has become pretty much impossible, one place to start is with the GOP’s opposition to the U.N. treaty on the global arms trade. The New York Times reports: The United Nations General Assembly voted overwhelmingly on Tuesday to approve a pioneering treaty aimed at regulating the enormous global trade in conventional weapons, for the first time linking sales to the human rights records of the buyers. […] The treaty, which took seven years to negotiate, reflects growing international sentiment that the multibillion-dollar weapons trade needs to be held to a moral standard. The hope is that even nations reluctant to ratify the treaty will feel public pressure to abide by its provisions. The treaty calls for sales to be evaluated on whether the weapons will be used to break humanitarian law, foment genocide or war crimes, abet terrorism or organized crime or slaughter women and children. The United States is one of the 154 members to support the treaty; it was opposed by Iran, North Korea and Syria. Prospects for the treaty are bleak in the United States Senate, however. As Steve Benen details, this is because it is opposed by the National Rifle Association and Republican Senators (and at least one Democrat, Max Baucus), partly on the grounds that it will violate Americans’ gun rights. Leading Tea Party Senator Ted Cruz is denouncing the treaty as “international gun regulation.” Senator Jim Inhofe called it “another attempt by internationalists to limit and infringe upon America’s sovereignty.” Last year Rand Paul claimed the treaty would pave the way for “full-scale gun CONFISCATION.” There’s no indication he’s since changed his views, which continue to be BEST EXPRESSED IN CAPITAL LETTERS. These and other Senators — which may end up including a few red state Dems, too, since over 50 Senators vowed months ago to oppose it — seem to be following the lead of the NRA, which has claimed that the treaty could “infringe on gun rights as understood in the United States and could force Americans on to an international registry,” as the Post recently put it.

### Advantage: Hunting

Biodiversity is on the brink of collapse- we are nearing environmental tipping points. Unless action is taken NOW environmental damage will escalate supercharging nuclear conflict and causing human extinction.

Torres[[3]](#footnote-3) February 10, 2016

But there’s another global catastrophe that the Bulletin neglected to consider — a catastrophe that will almost certainly have conflict multiplying effects no less than climate change. I’m referring here to biodiversity loss — i.e., the reduction in the total number of species, or in their population sizes, over time. The fact is that **in the past few centuries**, **the loss of bio**logical **diversity** around the world **has accelerated** at an incredible pace. Consider the findings of a 2015 paper published in Science Advances. According to this study, **we’ve** only recently **entered** the early stages of **the sixth mass extinction** event in life’s entire 3.5 billion year history. The previous mass extinctions are known as the “Big Five,” and the last one wiped out the dinosaurs some 65 million years ago. Unlike these past tragedies, though, **the** current **mass extinction** — called the “Holocene extinction event” — **is** almost entirely **the result** **of** a one species in particular, namely **Homo sapiens** (which ironically means the “wise man”). "If the environment implodes under the weight of civilization, then civilization itself is doomed." But biodiversity loss isn’t limited to species extinctions. As the founder of the Long Now Institute, Stewart Brand, [suggests](https://aeon.co/essays/we-are-not-edging-up-to-a-mass-extinction) in an article for Aeon, one could argue that **a more pressing issue is the reduction in population sizes** around the globe. For example, the [3rd Global Biodiversity Report](https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/gbo/gbo3-final-en.pdf) (GBO-3), published in 2010, found that the total abundance of vertebrates — a category that includes mammals, birds, reptiles, sharks, rays, and amphibians — living in the tropics declined by a whopping 59% between 1970 and 2006. In other words, the population size of creatures with a spine more than halved in only 36 years. The study also found that farmland birds in Europe have declined by 50% since 1980, **birds in North America have declined by 40%** between 1968 and 2003, and nearly 25% of all plant species are currently “threatened with extinction.” The latter statistic is especially worth noting because many people suffer from what’s called “[plant blindness](http://davidsuzuki.org/blogs/science-matters/2012/04/green-vision-offers-cure-for-plant-blindness/),” according to which we fail “to recognize the importance of plants in the biosphere and in human affairs.” Indeed, plants form the very bottom of the food chains upon which human life ultimately depends. Even more disturbing is the claim that amphibians “face the greatest risk” of extinction, with “42% of all amphibian species … declining in population,” as the GBO-3 reports. Consistent with this, [a more recent study](http://www.usgs.gov/newsroom/article.asp?ID=3597#.Vq5RnTYrI1g) from 2013 that focused on North America found that “frogs, toads and salamanders in the United States are disappearing from their habitats … at an alarming and rapid rate,” and are projected to “disappear from half of the habitats they currently occupy in about 20 years.” The decline of amphibian populations is ominous because amphibians are “ecological indicators” that are more sensitive to environmental changes than other organisms. As such they are the “canaries in the coal mine” that reflect the overall health of the ecosystems in which they reside. When they start to disappear, bigger problems are sure to follow. Yet [another comprehensive survey of the biosphere](http://www.footprintnetwork.org/images/article_uploads/LPR2014_summary_low_res.pdf) comes from the Living Planet Report — and its results are no less dismal than those of the GBO-3. For example, it finds that the global population of vertebrates between 1970 and 2010 dropped by an unbelievable 52%. Although the authors refrain from making any predictions based on their data, the reader is welcome to extrapolate this trend into the near future, noting that as ecosystems weaken, the likelihood of further population losses increases. This study thus concludes that humanity would “need 1.5 Earths to meet the demands we currently make on nature,” meaning that we either need to reduce our collective consumption and adopt less myopic economic policies or hurry up and start colonizing the solar system. Other studies have found that [20% of all reptile species](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/feb/15/reptile-species-face-extinction), [48% of all the world's primates](http://www.cnn.com/2010/TECH/science/02/17/endangered.species/), [50% of all freshwater turtles](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/feb/15/reptile-species-face-extinction), and[68% of plant species](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/programs/biodiversity/elements_of_biodiversity/extinction_crisis/) are currently threatened with extinction. There’s also talk about the Cavendish banana [going extinct as a result of a fungus](http://www.cnn.com/2015/07/22/africa/banana-panama-disease/index.html), and research has confirmed that honey bees, [which remain](http://www.aces.uiuc.edu/vista/html_pubs/BEEKEEP/CHAPT8/chapt8.html) “the most important insect that transfers pollen between flowers and between plants,” are dying out around the world at an alarming rate due to what’s called “colony collapse disorder” — perhaps a good metaphor for our technologically advanced civilization and its self-destructive tendencies. Turning to the world’s oceans, one finds few reasons for optimism here as well. Consider the fact that atmospheric carbon dioxide — the byproduct of burning fossil fuels — is not only warming up the oceans, but it’s making them [far more acidic](http://ocean.nationalgeographic.com/ocean/explore/pristine-seas/critical-issues-ocean-acidification/). The resulting changes in ocean chemistry are inducing a process known as “coral bleaching,” whereby coral loses the algae (called “zooxanthellae”) that it needs to survive. Today, [roughly 60% of coral reefs are in danger of becoming underwater ghost towns, and some 10% are already dead](http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/156613/). This has direct consequences for humanity [because coral reefs](http://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2011/06/13/losing-our-coral-reefs/) “provide us with food, construction materials (limestone) and new medicines,” and in fact “more than half of new cancer drug research is focused on marine organisms.” Similarly, yet [another study](http://news.sciencemag.org/biology/2014/05/snails-are-dissolving-pacific-ocean) found that ocean acidification is becoming so pronounced that the shells of “tiny marine snails that live along North America’s western coast” are literally dissolving in the water, resulting in “pitted textures” that give the shells a “cauliflower” or “sandpaper” appearance. Furthermore, human-created pollution that makes its way into the oceans is carving out vast regions in which the amount of dissolved oxygen is too low for marine life to survive. These regions are called “dead zones,” and [the most recent count](http://feru.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2013/07/Noone_Sumaila_Rogers-2013-Book.pdf) by Robert Diaz and his colleagues found more than 500 around the world. The biggest dead zone discovered so far is located in the Baltic Sea, and it’s been estimated to be about 27,000 square miles, or a little less than the size of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maryland combined. Scientists have even discovered an “island” of trash in the middle of the Pacific called the “Great Pacific Garbage Patch” that could be up to “[twice the size of the continental United States](http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/green-living/the-worlds-rubbish-dump-a-tip-that-stretches-from-hawaii-to-japan-778016.html).” Similar “patches” of floating plastic debris can be found in the Atlantic and Indian oceans as well, although these are not quite as impressive. The point is that “Earth’s final frontier” — the oceans — are becoming vast watery graveyards for a huge diversity of marine lifeforms, and in fact [a 2006 paper](http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/03/science/03fish.html?_r=0) in Science predicts that there could be virtually no more wild-caught seafood by 2048. Everywhere one looks, the biosphere is wilting — and a single bipedal species with large brains and opposable thumbs is almost entirely responsible for this worsening plight. If humanity continues to prune back the Tree of Life with reckless abandon, we could be forced to confront a global disaster of truly unprecedented proportions. Along these lines, [a 2012 article](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html) published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists claims that **humanity could be** teetering **on the brink of** a **catastrophic**, irreversible **collapse** of the global ecosystem. According to the paper, **there could be “tipping points**” — also called “critical thresholds” — lurking in the environment **that,** once crossed, could **initiate radical** and sudden **change**sin the biosphere. Thus, an event of this sort could be preceded by little or no warning: everything might look more or less okay, until the ecosystem is suddenly in ruins. We must, moving forward, never forget that just as we’re minds embodied, so too are we bodies environed, meaning that **if the environment implodes** under the weight of civilization**,** then **civilization** itself **is doomed**. While the threat of nuclear weapons deserves serious attention from political leaders and academics, as the Bulletin correctly observes, it’s even more imperative that we focus on the broader “contextual problems” that could inflate the overall probability of wars and terrorism in the future. Climate change and **biodiversity loss {is} a**re both **conflict multiplier**s of precisely this sort, and each is a contributing factor that’s exacerbating the other. If we fail to make these threats a top priority in 2016, **the likelihood of nuclear weapons** — or some other form of emerging technology, including biotechnology and artificial intelligence — **being used in the future** **will** only **increase**. **Perhaps there’s** still **time to avert** the sixth mass extinction or a **sudden collapse** of the global ecosystem**. But** time is running out — **the doomsday clock is ticking.**

**Handguns are used for hunting.**

**Burke[[4]](#footnote-4) February 4, 2013**

**There were 13.7 million hunters in the United States** over age 16 -- **12.7 million of whom used** rifles, **shotguns or handguns for hunting**, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That means hunters constituted only 15.9 to 18.1 percent of the estimated 70-80 million gun owners in the U.S. in 2011 -- the latest year for which statistics are available. In a Dec. 28 [national report](http://digitalmedia.fws.gov/utils/getfile/collection/document/id/860/filename/861), USF&W said **13.7 million individuals over age 16 self-identified as hunters**, and that 12.7 million used guns (shotguns, rifles or handguns) while hunting.

**Handguns are key to hunting since they’re A) most effective B) light to carry and C) cheap. Hawks ‘02**

[www.chuckhawks.com/handgun\_hunting.htm](http://www.chuckhawks.com/handgun_hunting.htm) Handgun Hunting By Chuck Hawks 2002

Introduction This article is about the handguns and handgun cartridges most suitable for hunting. I am limiting the discussion to conventional handguns and cartridges. Bolt action or other exotic single shot pistols with barrels in excess of 10" in length will not be covered. Such weapons really amount to carbines without a butt stock. Nor will it deal with rifle cartridges like the .22 Hornet, .30-30 Winchester and .45-70 Govt. that are sometimes adapted to these exotic handguns. No, the subjects of this article are traditional revolving and autoloading pistols, plus the ubiquitous T/C Contender single shot pistol, suitable for hunting small and big game animals in a sporting manner. Any hunting pistol should have good, fully adjustable iron sights or an optical sight (red dot or conventional long eye relief scope). They should ideally have barrels of 6" to 10" in length, and fit into a holster. A barrel at least 6 inches long is needed for its long sight radius, and to get adequate performance from the high velocity pistol cartridges that are normally used for hunting. It is difficult to find a holster for gun with a barrel longer than 10 inches, and awkward to carry such a gun in a holster. These traditional handguns are chambered for straight cased pistol cartridges ranging from the .22 LR to the 454 Casull and .480 Ruger. They are a joy to carry afield, and the most sporting and rewarding of all firearms with which to hunt. In the hands of an accomplished shooter, they can be very effective. Many rifle hunters that regularly bag game cannot shoot as accurately as an accomplished shooter with such a handgun. In some respects handgun hunting is similar to bow hunting. Both are fairly short range weapons that demand superior hunting and marksmanship skills for consistent success. The hunter must be able to stalk within close range of the intended trophy. This is a very sporting proposition, one it would do many rifle shooters well to emulate. A handgun, however, is more accurate than a bow. And a bullet from a powerful handgun is more humane than an arrow, as it kills very quickly with a well-placed bullet. In that sense it is like a rifle. To me, handgun hunting is hunting at its finest. Not only does the taking of game with a handgun bring a special feeling of pride, the pistol offers some positive advantages over the rifle as a hunting weapon. One of the most important of these is lighter weight. Obviously it is easier to spend the day carrying a 14 inch long, 3 pound pistol in a holster than an 42 inch long, eight pound rifle in the hand or slung over the shoulder.

**Hawks 2:**

For the price of two revolvers, say a .22 Convertible and a centerfire magnum, plus great deal of enjoyable practice, you can join the growing ranks of those who hunt everything from ground squirrels to big game with a pistol.

Also prefer my link because it only gets larger in time: the ranks of handgun hunters are growing.

**Hunting collapses biodiversity-current regulations don’t solve.**

**Muller[[5]](#footnote-5) Fall 2011:**

**Hunting by humans operates perversely**. The kill ratio at around a hundred feet with a semi-automatic weapon and scope is much greater than 10% to 20%**. The animal,** no matter how well adapted to escape natural predation (healthy, alert, smart, quick, etc.) **has** virtually **no way to escape** **death** once it is in the cross hairs of a scope mounted on a rifle. Nature’s adaptive structures and behaviors that have evolved during millions of years simply count for naught when man is the hunter. Most deer, for example, would not perceive a rifle hunter as a predator or a source of danger from the distance at which deer can be shot with a big game rifle (about 200 feet to 400 yards depending on the terrain). A wolf at that distance, even though detected, would be totally ignored. Even the much smaller range of bow-hunter (about 50-75 feet) is barely of concern to deer. Deer may start to keep an eye on a hunter at that distance, but the evasion instinct doesn’t kick in until it’s too late. **Hunters go after healthy big animals** for trophies and meat**. This leaves the** diseased and congenitally **weak animals to breed -–**thereby **degrading the gene pool** and spreading disease. The hunted species becomes a degenerate and runty imitation of the real species that evolved in the habitat before human hunting. Hunting by humans has never been akin to natural predation. **Using modern technology makes matters worse**, but even hunting by indigenous people, before the blessings of Western civilization were bestowed on them, was just as destructive, only at a slower rate. The North American mammoth, the Patagonian giant sloth, the pygmy hippopotamus, the elephant bird of Madagascar are just some examples of animals that were hunted into extinction by indigenous hunters. To see exactly how hunting is destructive to an ecosystem, let’s look at a specific game animal. Probably the most widely hunted animal in North America is one of the common species of deer, the white-tailed deer. Let’s consider that a naturally segmented area has sufficient browse to feed a deer herd of 400 animals. Wildlife biologists would describe this by saying that the biological carrying capacity of the area for deer is 400. Nature has adaptations in place to ensure that the carrying capacity that is appropriate for that species is not exceeded. What would happen if the deer population increased to substantially over 400 in one year? Let’s say that with all normal control adaptations in place (including natural predators) the herd size reaches 500 healthy individuals. At the start of the next winter season, several adaptations would kick in to ensure a smaller amount of fawns the following year. If deer are hungry (not starving, but not well fed either), the sex drive of the bucks declines and the frequency of ovulation of the does decreases; the does become receptive less frequently than they would if plenty of browse is available. Since the browse is now insufficient to feed all 500 animals, a portion of the deer population would not reproduce during that season. With the normal die-off during the winter and the smaller than normal birth during the spring, the total population would be reduced to less than 500. Within a few seasons the populations would again stabilize around the capacity of the territory. If the herd size dropped substantially below the carrying capacity (say to 300), other natural adaptations would kick in (for example, does who have lots of browse during the rut are more likely to have twins or triplets) to bring the population back up to the normal carrying capacity of 400. Many other adaptations, some simple and some fairly involved and not yet completely understood, are used by nature to maintain the population at the carrying capacity. These adaptations with which the species have evolved are based on conditions that have been true for millions of years. Human hunting totally destroys some of these assumed conditions. Normally, **left to their own devices, the sex ratio** of male to female animals **is about 50-50**. Deer are born about evenly male and female. Most “sport” or “trophy**”** hunters prefer to take bucksrather than does. Almost **all state game agencies mandate** that during the regular hunting season **only bucks** (antlered deer) and no does **are shot**. Under certain extreme conditions, where a deer population has been totally mismanaged for years, “doe permits” are issued in addition to the regular deer tags in a desperate attempt to mitigate the mess that the agencies have created over the years. This policy of shooting out bucks distorts the gender ratio of the population. Let see what happens when that ratio changes from 50-50 ratio to 80-20 –leaving four times as many does as bucks. This is not at all uncommon. In Texas and the Southwest, in general, **years of mismanagement have pushed the** doe to buck **ratio as high as 10:1** in some areas. Let’s look at two herds – one unhunted with the gender ratio intact at 50/50 and one hunted with the gender ratio skewed to 80/20. Otherwise everything is the same; both herds live in an area where there is sufficient browse for 400 animals. Nature’s adaptations that adjust the population to the browse will now miscalculate and cause an overpopulation for the hunted herd but leave the unhunted herd stable at 400 animals. Based on 50-50 ratio, a herd of 400 will consist of 200 bucks and 200 does. Normal browse conditions signal to each doe to give birth to a single fawn. Assuming a winter die-off of 100 deer, the surviving herd would consist of 150 bucks and 150 does. Each of the 150 does would give birth to 150 fawns. The herd size, including the new 150 fawns is now 450. Fawns have about a 2/3 chance of surviving until the next fall because they are subject to more predation than adult deer; for example, coyotes will predate on fawns but rarely on fully grown deer. Other mortality rates are also higher for fawns than adult deer. At the next rut the herd is back to 400. Based on an 80/20 gender ratio, a 100 animal winter die-off, and normal browse conditions, there will 240 does and 60 bucks in the surviving herd. The 240 does will give birth to 240 fawns of which 160 will survive. At the next rut the herd size is now 460 instead of 400. That’s a 15% increase over the normal herd size. If we factor in additionally that in the hunted herd the multiple birth rate is much higher (34% as opposed to 18%) and that yearling does will go into estrus — the rate of increase is even higher as is shown in the table to the right. **A few successive seasons like that and** the herd size approaches conditions where massive**, catastrophic starvation and die-offs are inevitable**. Hunting is not the cure but the cause of overpopulation and starvation. Luke Dommer, the founder of the Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting, has proposed several times to various state wildlife agencies that if they are serious about using hunting as a population control tool in areas where the sex ratio is already badly distorted, they should institute a doe-only season. (Taking no bucks but only does until the ratio is again stabilized at 50:50). All agencies have rejected that proposal – thereby giving up any pretense of ecologically motivated sound wildlife management. They quite consciously and openly state that they are in business to provide the maximum number of live targets to hunters each year. The state wildlife agencies encourage the destruction of the naturally evolved ecosystem by encouraging human hunting that balloons the population of the game species at the expense of the non-game species. Management techniques, in addition to sex-ratio distortion, include removal of natural predators (e.g. wolves, coyotes, panthers, bears) altering the natural habitat to provide additional browse for game species and destroying the habitat of nongame species (e.g. clear-cutting and/or burning areas and sowing them with oats for deer at the expense of rabbits, voles, various reptiles and amphibians – and many other non-game species). The activity of human hunting is not and never has been a sustainable, mutually beneficial, predator-prey relationship. Human hunting techniques, even the most primitive ones, are far too efficient to meet the conditions required of a natural predator-prey relationship. In modern times, with new technology, the efficiency becomes totally lopsided so as to cause instant habitat degeneration. Add to this the conscious mismanagement of habitat to further degrade and obviate all natural corrective measures. Using **techniques such as sex-ratio distortion, habitat manipulation, the removal of natural predators and the introduction of exotic game** species **destroy**s **biodiversity**. **The goal is to maximize** the number of targets for **human hunting,** thereby **destroying the natural**lyevolved **ecosystems and putting them at the brink of total collapse**. The number of animals of game species (native and exotic) is maximized at the expense of all others. The naturally evolved adaptations that insure biodiversity are short-circuited. **The way that these ecosystems can recover is to prohibit human hunting** and other forms of destruction of these animals.

### Advantage: Latin American Relations

#### US-Latin American relations are waning now- the influx of US guns due to lax regulations is pissing them off. Decisive federal action to lessen gun ownership creates the perception of cooperation on instability- fixes relations.

Sweig 13 Julia E. Sweig (Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies) “A Strategy to Reduce Gun Trafficking and Violence in the Americas” Council on Foreign Relations, Policy Innovation Memorandum No. 36 July 2013 http://www.cfr.org/arms-industries-and-trade/strategy-reduce-gun-trafficking-violence-americas/p31155

The flow of high-powered weaponry from the United States to Latin America and the Caribbean exacerbates soaring rates of gun-related violence in the region and undermines U.S. influence in the Western Hemisphere. Though the Senate rejected measures to expand background checks on firearms sales, reinstate a federal assault-weapons ban, and make straw purchasing a federal crime, the Obama administration can still take executive action to reduce the availability and trafficking of assault weapons and ammunition in the Americas. The Problem With the launch of the Merida Initiative in 2007, the U.S. and Mexican governments agreed to a regional security framework guided by the principle of shared responsibility. Among its domestic obligations, the United States committed to intensify its efforts to combat the illegal trafficking of weapons and ammunition to Mexico and elsewhere in the Americas. Six years later, little has changed: the U.S. civilian firearms market continues to supply the region's transnational criminal networks with high-powered weaponry that is purchased with limited oversight, especially from unlicensed individuals at gun shows, flea markets, pawn shops, and on the Internet. Lax U.S. gun laws enable straw purchasers, including those under investigation in Operation Fast and Furious, to legally procure thousands of AK-47 and AR-15 variants every year and traffic them across the border to sell them illegally to criminal factions. U.S. government data highlights the problem. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' (ATF) Web-based firearm trace request and analysis system, eTrace, enables law enforcement officials to collaborate with ATF to track the path of recovered weapons from the manufacturer or importer though the distribution chain to the first retail purchase. Over 70 percent of the ninety-nine thousand weapons recovered by Mexican law enforcement since 2007 were traced to U.S. manufacturers and importers. Likewise, 2011 eTrace data for the Caribbean indicates that over 90 percent of the weapons recovered and traced in the Bahamas and over 80 percent of those in Jamaica came from the United States. The ATF has not released data for Central America, but the numbers are likely similar. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime reports that easy access to firearms is a major factor influencing homicide trends in Latin America and the Caribbean; the gun-related homicide rate in Latin America exceeded the global average in 2010 by more than 30 percent. The World Bank estimates that crime and violence cost Central America nearly 8 percent of its GDP when accounting for the costs of law enforcement, security, and health care. The U.S. government has empowered law enforcement in the region to recover and investigate the source of weapons used by criminal factions. In December 2009, the ATF introduced the Spanish version of eTrace. Since 2012, the State Department has funded the Organization of American States' (OAS) program to provide firearm-marking equipment and training to law enforcement in twenty-five countries. Yet, these efforts notwithstanding, Mexican authorities intercepted only 12.7 percent of the roughly 250,000 guns smuggled into Mexico between 2010 and 2012, while the ATF intercepted no more than 2 percent. In effect, the United States undermines its own efforts at preventing arms trafficking with its unwillingness to strengthen oversight of the firearms industry and lukewarm support for multilateral agreements. The United States is one of three countries that have not ratified the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials (CIFTA). In addition to requiring parties to criminalize the illegal manufacture, import, or export of high-powered weapons, the treaty encourages information exchange and cooperation on initiatives including the marking and tracing of weapons and the identification of criminal transit routes. President Bill Clinton signed CIFTA in 1997 and submitted it for ratification to the Senate, where it has lingered for over a decade. Likewise, although the United States voted in favor of the United Nations' Arms Trade Treaty in April 2013, it has yet to sign or ratify the treaty. Given the political complexity of legislative action to reduce arms trafficking, Latin American governments have moved to disarm criminal networks by tightening their own gun codes: Mexico prohibits the sale of handguns with calibers greater than .38 and Colombia bans civilians from carrying firearms in Medellin and Bogota. Brazil, Mexico, and El Salvador have implemented gun buyback programs. At the 2012 Summit of the Americas, heads of state demanded a new approach to the failed war on drugs, including greater efforts to disarm criminal networks. U.S. allies have repeatedly urged the United States to reinstate the federal assault-weapons ban and take action against weapons trafficking. Their patience—and the United States' credibility as a responsible partner—is waning. U.S. action will strengthen those regional heads of state who want to work with the United States and who also regard lax U.S. gun laws as fueling violence and anti-Americanism among their own publics. Across the board, Latin American governments are turning toward the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States and the Union of South American Nations, which pointedly exclude the United States, to handle regional political and security dilemmas. Stronger action to regulate the southward flow of weapons represents an opportunity for the Obama administration to enhance U.S. relevance in the region, especially at the early stages of new regional institutions and security protocols. Recommendations In the absence of major legislative action, the Obama administration should pursue the following executive and diplomatic actions—consistent with the Second Amendment—to reduce the trafficking of firearms that contribute to crime and violence across the Americas: Expand nationwide the state-level multiple-sale reporting requirement for assault weapons. In 2011, the Obama administration adopted a federal rule that requires gun dealers in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico to report sales of more than two semiautomatic rifles to the same person within a five-day period. Unintentionally, the rule shifted gun sales to states not covered by the requirement, prompting the need for improved oversight of all suspicious semiautomatic firearm sales. Incorporate strategies to reduce existing stocks of illegal firearms into U.S.-Brazil dialogue on defense and security. As home to the two largest firearms industries in the hemisphere, the United States and Brazil have a mutual interest in incorporating this topic into their ongoing bilateral policy dialogues. For example, sharing best practices regarding gun buyback programs in border regions on the U.S.-Mexican and Brazilian-Bolivian borders will build mutual confidence between the two largest Hemispheric powers. Exclude firearms and ammunition products from the Export Control Reform Initiative. As currently crafted, President Barack Obama's reform initiative may make it easier for U.S. manufacturers to export military-style weapons to allies. Liberalizing export restrictions on firearms poses a serious security risk to the Americas; potential reexport of firearms without U.S. oversight could jeopardize local law enforcement efforts to keep weapons from criminal groups and rogue security forces in the region. Apply the "sporting test" standards of the 1968 Gun Control Act. This provision prohibits the import of weapons not "suitable or readily adaptable for sporting purposes," including but not limited to military-style firearms. Throughout the 1990s, under Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, the ATF adhered to the sporting test guidelines, preventing thousands of assault weapons from entering the U.S. firearms market. Enforcement of the test lapsed under President George W. Bush and has not been reestablished under President Obama. Continue to support federal, state, and local initiatives to improve regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market. As grassroots organizations prepare their long-term legislative strategies, the White House should back state and local legislation, based on reforms in Maryland and Connecticut, which bans the sale of assault rifles and high-capacity magazines, broadens existing background check requirements for firearm purchases, and modernizes gun-owner registries by requiring, among others, that buyers submit their fingerprints when applying for a gun license. While piecemeal regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market does not represent a comprehensive solution, passage of state and local measures, including gun buyback programs, will reduce the number of weapons in circulation and available for smuggling and generate momentum for a broader federal approach over the long run. Conclusion Strengthening U.S. gun laws will not eliminate gun violence in Latin America, where weak judiciaries and police forces, the proliferation of gangs and black markets, and deep inequality exacerbate violent conflict. Nonetheless, lax U.S. gun regulations do enable international trafficking. While the effects of tighter regulation will not be felt overnight, such steps will offset widespread regional views that the United States remains indifferent to its own role in exacerbating one of Latin America's most significant challenges. Although recent federal gun control measures have run aground on congressional opposition, the Obama administration retains considerable leeway in the foreign policy arena, where concerted action can help U.S. allies in Latin America make the case to their constituents and to other skeptical governments that the United States can be a legitimate partner in combating transnational crime. At a juncture in U.S.-Latin American relations that again features both tension and opportunity, these actions will demonstrate that the United States is prepared, if imperfectly, to fulfill its shared responsibility for regional security and enhance American standing and positive influence in Latin America.

#### US-LAC relations are key to combatting climate change and preventing nuclear proliferation.

Brookings Institution 08 “Rethinking U.S.—Latin American Relations: A Hemispheric Partnership for a Turbulent World” Report of the Partnership for the Americas Commission, 2008 http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Reports/2008/11/24-latin-america-partnership/1124\_latin\_america\_partnership.PDF

Developments in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) have a very signi cant impact on the daily lives of those who live in the United States. Yet because of a lack of trust, an inability to undertake stable commitments by some countries, and di erent U.S. priorities, the United States and Latin America have rarely developed a genuine and sustained partnership to address regional—let alone global—challenges. If a hemispheric partnership remains elusive, the costs to the United States and its neighbors will be high, in terms of both growing risks and missed opportunities. Without a partnership, the risk that criminal networks pose to the region’s people and institutions will continue to grow. Peaceful nuclear technology may be adopted more widely, but without proper regional safeguards, the risks of nuclear proliferation will increase. Adaptation to climate change will take place through isolated, improvised measures by individual countries, rather than through more e ective e orts based on mutual learning and coordination. Illegal immigration to the United States will continue unabated and unregulated, adding to an ever-larger underclass that lives and works at the margins of the law. Finally, the countries around the hemisphere, including the United States, will lose valuable opportunities to tap new markets, make new investments, and access valuable resources. Today, several changes in the region have made a hemispheric partnership both possible and necessary. e key challenges faced by the United States and the hemisphere’s other countries—such as securing sustainable energy supplies, combating and adapting to climate change, and combating organized crime and drug tra cking—have become so complex and deeply transnational that they cannot be managed or overcome by any single country. At the same time, the LAC countries are diversifying their international economic and political relations, making them less reliant on the United States. Finally, the LAC countries are better positioned than before to act as reliable partners. This report does not advance a single, grand scheme for reinventing hemispheric relations. Instead, the report is based on two simple propositions: e countries of the hemisphere share common interests; and the United States should engage its hemispheric neighbors on issues where shared interests, objectives, and solutions are easiest to identify and can serve as the basis for an e ective partnership. In this spirit, the report o ers a series of modest, pragmatic recommendations that, if implemented, could help the countries of the region manage key transnational challenges and realize the region’s potential.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction.

Snow and Hannam 14 Deborah Snow and Peter Hannam. March 31, 2014 Climate Change Could Make Humans Extinct Warns Health Expert. Sydney Morning Herald. Senior writer at the Sydney Morning Herald, Environment Editor of Sydney Morning Herald. http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/climate-change-could-make-humans-extinct-warns-health-expert-20140330-35rus.html)

The Earth is warming so rapidly that unless humans can arrest the trend, we risk becoming ''extinct'' as a species, a leading Australian health academic has warned.¶ Helen Berry, associate dean in the faculty of health at the University of Canberra, said while the Earth has been warmer and colder at different points in the planet's history, the rate of change has never been as fast as it is today.¶ ''What is remarkable, and alarming, is the speed of the change since the 1970s, when we started burning a lot of fossil fuels in a massive way,'' she said. ''We can't possibly evolve to match this rate and, unless we get control of it, it will mean our extinction eventually.''¶ Professor Berry is one of three leading academics who have contributed to the health chapter of a Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report due on Monday. She and co-authors Tony McMichael, of the Australian National University, and Colin Butler, of the University of Canberra, have outlined the health risks of rapid global warming in a companion piece for The Conversation, also published on Monday. The three warn that the adverse effects on population health and social stability have been ''missing from the discussion'' on climate change.¶ ¶ ''Human-driven climate change poses a great threat, unprecedented in type and scale, to wellbeing, health and perhaps even to human survival,'' they write.¶ They predict that the greatest challenges will come from undernutrition and impaired child development from reduced food yields; hospitalisations and deaths due to intense heatwaves, fires and other weather-related disasters; and the spread of infectious diseases.¶ They warn the ''largest impacts'' will be on poorer and vulnerable populations, winding back recent hard-won gains of social development programs.¶ Projecting to an average global warming of 4 degrees by 2100, they say ''people won't be able to cope, let alone work productively, in the hottest parts of the year''.¶ They say that action on climate change would produce ''extremely large health benefits'', which would greatly outweigh the costs of curbing emission growth.¶ A leaked draft of the IPCC report notes that a warming climate would lead to fewer cold weather-related deaths but the benefits would be ''greatly'' outweighed by the impacts of more frequent heat extremes. Under a high emissions scenario, some land regions will experience temperatures four to seven degrees higher than pre-industrial times, the report said.¶ While some adaptive measures are possible, limits to humans' ability to regulate heat will affect health and potentially cut global productivity in the warmest months by 40 per cent by 2100.

### TOC Solvency

#### Thus the plan: Resolved: The 50 states of the United States and the District of Columbia should ban the private ownership of handguns. Santos 13:

**Michael De Los Santos January 14, 2013**

**(Gun Control Facts: The Commerce Clause Makes Gun Control a State Question. Policy.Mic.** [**http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg**](http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg)**)**

This clause gives the federal government the right to regulate interstate commerce, but maintains **the states right to regulate commerce within its borders**. This is the same system which brought the national highway system. Under this clause, states can [make the argument](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/93-1260.ZO.html) **that regulating the sale of firearms within their borders is the right of the state under the Constitution**. Both state and federal governments will continue to look to regulate the sale of firearms. They both will attempt to use the Constitution as a basis for their right to regulate this industry. However, when we look at the Commerce Clause of the Constitution it appears that the right to regulate commerce within their borders makes this a state’s rights issue**. The role of the federal government is to regulate interstate commerce, and therefore should leave the gun control debate to the states** and focus their efforts on the interstate sales of this industry.

#### 1. Most recent, international gun control meta study flows aff. Beauchamp 2016:

(Zack Beauchamp. Februrary 29, 2016. Vox World. <http://www.vox.com/2016/2/29/11120184/gun-control-study-international-evidence>. Editor of ThinkProgress Ideas. A huge international study of gun control finds strong evidence that it actually works.)

What do we really know about the research on whether gun restrictions help reduce gun deaths? Even for PhDs, this is a difficult question. There's been a mountain of research on the subject, but these dozens of studies conducted over many years and in many different countries reach a broad and sometimes contradictory range of conclusions. It's hard to know what it really tells us, taken together, about whether gun laws can reduce gun violence. **A just-released study**, published in the February issue of [Epidemiologic Reviews](https://epirev.oxfordjournals.org/content/38/1/140.full.pdf+html), seeks to resolve this problem. It **systematically reviewed** the **evidence from around the world on gun laws and gun violence**, looking to see if the best studies come to similar conclusions. It is the first such study to look at the international researchin this way. The authors are careful to note that their findings do not conclusively prove that gun restrictions reduce gun deaths. However, they did find a compelling trend whereby **new restrictions on gun purchasing and ownership tended to be followed by a decline in gun deaths.** "Across countries, instead of seeing an increase in the homicide rate, we saw a reduction," Julian Santaella-Tenorio, a doctoral student in epidemiology at Columbia University and the study's lead author, told me. Santaella-Tenorio's **study** (co-authored with Columbia professors Magdalena Cerdá and Sandro Galea, as well as the University of North Carolina's Andrés Villaveces) **examined** roughly **130 studies that had been conducted in 10 different countries**. Each of those 130 studies had looked at some specific change in gun laws and its effect on homicide and/or suicide rates. Most of those 130 studies looked at law changes in the developed world, such as the US, Australia, and Austria. A few looked at gun laws in developing countries, specifically Brazil and South Africa. This isn't, then, a study that compiled its own original data on one specific gun law. It's actually more valuable than that: It's telling us what all the different studies on individual laws say when you examine them put together. So what do Santaella-Tenorio et al. conclude? First, and most importantly, that gun violence declined after countries pass a raft of gun laws at the same time: "The simultaneous implementation of laws targeting multiple firearms restrictions is associated with reductions in firearm deaths," the study finds. This finding doesn't highlight one specific law, like an assault weapon ban, in isolation. There were "so many different kinds of laws," Santaella-Tenorio explains, that it was hard to make good international comparisons on every specific kind of gun restriction. Rather, countries passed big packages of gun laws, which overhauled the nation's firearm code fairly broadly, which all tended to share similar features. According to Santaella-Tenorio, they generally included: Banning "weapons that are actually very powerful," like automatic weapons. "They all implemented background checks." "They all required permits and licenses for purchasing guns." South Africa's comprehensive Firearm Control Act, passed in 2000, contained all these measures. One study found that **firearm** homicides in five major South African cities **decreased by 13.6 percent** per year for the next five years. "**Reductions in nonfirearm homicides were also observed**," Santaella-Tenorio et al. note, "although not as pronounced as the ones observed for firearm homicides." Austria's 1997 firearm law, similarly, required background checks, limited access to powerful firearms, and imposed rules about how gun owners had to store their guns. Santaella-Tenorio reviewed two studies on Austria's 1997 law, both of which found evidence that the law had reduced deaths. According to one of them, firearm homicides went down by 4.8 percent, while suicides went down by 9.9 percent. Australia's 1996 [National Firearms Agreement](http://www.vox.com/2015/8/27/9212725/australia-buyback) (which outright confiscated 650,000 guns, in addition to imposing background checks and licensing rules) is perhaps the best-studied of any of the international laws. Santaella-Tenorio et al. reviewed eight studies on it, most of which found clear and strong evidence of a reduction in firearm deaths after the law's passage. One study, for example, compared the Australian state of Victoria to others around the country. Victoria had passed a raft of firearm restrictions in 1988, so the NFA didn't change policy there that much. But firearm deaths went down countrywide by an average of 14 percent in other states relative to Victoria, suggesting that the NFA provisions specifically had made the difference. Santaella-Tenorio and his co-authors also found evidence that specific laws, such as background checks and rules on storage, reduced specific kinds of gun deaths. "**Laws restricting the purchase** of (e.g., background checks) and access to (e.g., safer storage) firearms," they write, "**are** also **associated with lower rates of intimate partner homicides** **and** firearm **unintentional deaths** in children, respectively." Santaella-Tenorio and his colleagues included the United States in their overall review, of course. They found something interesting here too: Generally speaking, **there's strong consensus that restricting access to guns tends to reduce gun deaths**. One study, for example, looked at Missouri's 2007 repeal of its law requiring a permit to purchase a firearm (essentially, it had reduced background check requirements). This study found that after 2007, Missouri's homicide rate jumped by 25 percent. [No other changes in law or circumstance](http://www.realclearpolicy.com/blog/2014/02/17/whats_the_matter_with_the_missouri_murder_rate_841.html) appear to be able to explain the increase. By contrast, laws favored by the National Rifle Association (such as concealed carry or stand your ground), when implemented, either had no effect on gun deaths or increased gun violence. And Santaella-Tenorio found this by considering not just studies that reached this conclusion, but also studies that supported loosening gun laws. Most of the studies that supported these laws were written by a handful of authors, like Florida State's Gary Kleck and independent scholar/Fox News columnist John Lott. Scholars who reexamined their conclusions, sometimes even using their own data, generally came to the opposite results. For instance, a study by Lott and the University of Georgia's David Mustard found that laws permitting concealed carry reduced homicides in states and counties that passed them. However, a subsequent study that reexamined the same data found no effect, and that Lott and Mustard had used flawed statistical procedures in examining the data. Another Lott study found that castle doctrine laws — laws that eliminate the legal duty to retreat before using deadly force, but only in your home — reduced homicides by 9 percent. But a second study came to the opposite conclusion, finding an uptick in homicides after states passed such laws. A third study looking at stand-your-ground laws — which go beyond castle doctrine in eliminating retreat duties outside the home as well — also found an uptick in deaths. Santaella-Tenorio summarize: "Stand your ground laws were associated with a 6.8% increase in homicide rates, mainly driven by increments (14.7%) in homicide rates among white males." The point, then, is that the **pro-gun studies tended to be outliers in the literature**, and were not supported by the most rigorous available analysis.

#### 2. Empirics show a ban reduces the Cultural Fascination with Guns Lemieux ‘14

Effect of Gun Culture and Firearm Laws on Gun Violence and Mass Shootings in the United States: A Multi-Level Quantitative Analysis, Frederic Lemieux, 2014, The George Washington University, United States of America

The two main arguments made by gun enthusiasts (the culture-based argument) and gun control advocates (the access-based argument) can be tested at the international level between 25 industrialized countries who are members of the Organization for Economic Development and Co-Operation (OEDC). In order to verify the validity of both assertions, a first series of correlation analyses were conducted on both gun ownership rates and on the rates of death by guns. The results show a statistically significant correlation (p<0.05) between the firearm ownership rate and the following: the Gini Index (r=-0.47), the percentage of GDP devoted to military expenditures (r=0.47), the total money spent on gun movies (r=0.74), and the rate of money spent on gun movies (r=0.57). Also, the type of regulation regarding gun access (permissive or restrictive) is negatively correlated with gun ownership rates (r=-0.46, p<0.05). In other words, the more restrictive the gun regulations are the lower the gun ownership rate. It appears that in these preliminary analyses both the gun enthusiasts and the gun control advocates’ assertions are valid based on the results related to gun movies and gun access regulations.

## Solvency

Resolved: The 50 states of the United States of America and Washington, D.C. will ban private ownership of handguns in a buyback program modeled off the one implemented in Australia.

Spark 2015 clarifies:

How did Australia do it? **In two nationwide**, federally funded **gun buybacks, plus large-scale voluntary surrenders and state gun amnesties** both before and after Port Arthur, **Australia collected and destroyed more than a million firearms**, perhaps a third of the national stock, [according to Professor Philip Alpers](http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/16/opinion/australia-gun-laws/index.html) of the University of Sydney, who is editor of [gunpolicy.org](http://www.gunpolicy.org/" \t "_blank). No other nation had attempted anything on this scale. **The** national **government** also **banned** the **importation** **of** new automatic and semiautomatic **weapons**. And **the buyback was paid for by a special one-off tax on all Australians**. What was the political fallout? It wasn't without cost to John Howard.

I’ll grant you links to DA’s in CX so default that I meet T and spec interps if they don’t clarify.

**This evidence is on point – literature reviews, comprehensive data, studies that prove causation, and analytic warrants all flow aff – the aff would solve violence. Dixon 11:**

Dixon '11 (Nicholas Dixon, associate professor of philosophy, Alma College, "Handguns, Philosophers, and the Right to Self-Defense," International Journal of Applied Philosophy, Vol. 25 No. 2, 2011)

Before turning to nonconsequentialist defenses of handguns based on the right to self-defense, a brief sketch of my original utilitarian argument for prohibition is in order. Its starting point is a striking set of international data. The United States far outstrips five other developed countries (Australia, Canada, Israel, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) in both handgun ownership and handgun homicide rates per 100,000 people. The United States' handgun homicide rate is over twenty times greater than that in these other countries, and its handgun ownership rate is over nine times as high. 4 My reason for singling out handguns for prohibition in the United States is that they are, in this country, the firearm of choice of criminals, being used in at least 72.2 percent of firearms homicides in the years 2006—2010.5 Substantially reducing the number of handguns in the U.S. will very likely substantially reduce the rate of total homicide. This prediction is based not only on the noted statistics, but also on the following considerations, which constitute a rudimentary causal theory. First, a large proportion of these crimes is currently committed with handguns. Since 1970, approximately one-half of the homicides in the U.S. have been committed with handguns. In 2006-2010, an average of 6,909 homicides (48.7 percent of all homicides) was committed per year With handguns.6 Second, because of their cheapness, concealability, ease of use, and lethality, handguns are ideally suited to the commission of crimes and criminals are highly unlikely to be able to commit as many violent crimes by switching to alternative weapons. Third, other weapons that assailants might substitute for firearms are far less lethal than handguns, and in the case of firearms other than handguns, although the wounds that they inflict are more serious, their lower concealability makes it harder to inflict wounds in the first place.' Since the appearance of my first articles, social scientists have performed far more sophisticated statistical analyses of much more comprehensive comparative data, and they provide strong support for my causal hypothesis that prohibition would reduce homicide in the U S. In three separate studies of fourteen, eighteen, and twenty-one countries, Martin Killias has found that the prevalence of firearms **is** strongly correlated with the firearms homicide rate. The first study indicated a correlation of .746 (where 1 is a perfect correlation), with a probability of less than 0.01 that this would happen by chance, the second produced a correlation of .476—.610 (p<0.031) and the third indicated a correlation of .54 (p<0.05) when the countries with extreme scores are excluded.10 More important, both Killias's and other studies have shown a correlation between gun ownership and total (gun plus non-gun) homicide rates. Most notably, in a 2000 study of twenty-six high-income countries, David Hemenway and Matthew Miller found a correlation of .69 (p<0.00). This study is of special interest because it investigated twenty-six of the twenty-seven countries with a population of over one million defined by the World Bank as high income or highly industrialized**.** Focusing on a more homogenous group of countries helps to narrow attention to the variable in question—firearms—and minimizes the confounding effect of other causes of homicide. Hemenway and Miller's study found that the overall homicide rate in the U.S. was 5.98 times higher than in the other twenty-five countries, thus obvi- ating the objection that the total homicide rate in these other countries could be just as high as in the U.S., due 'to non-handgun homicides. Finally, in a study of twelve countries using some of Killias's data, Gregg Lee Carter concludes that total homicide is correlated with gun ownership at a rate of .67 and with handgun ownership at a rate of .84." In its review of the literature on the connection between firearms and violence, the National Academy of Science concludes that "in comparisons among countries, there is a substantial association between gun ownership and homicide." 14 To complete the argument that these correlations indicate that handguns cause murder, we need to rule out alternative explanations of the data. First, causation may operate in reverse, in that handgun ownership may be a response to high homicide rates, not a cause, because some people buy firearms to protect them- selves against crime. Second, both handgun ownership and homicide rates may be a function of a third factor, while not affecting each other. In this vein, some proponents of gun rights argue that the United States' very high handgun owner- ship and overall homicide rates are both caused by some third factor unrelated to guns. The second hypothesis is hard to reconcile with the data. Any causes that lead Americans to buy more guns and commit more homicides than inhabitants of other affluent societies—for example, a greater propensity to violence—should equally affect homicide in general and not just homicides committed with firearms. What we find, in contrast, is a far greater disparity between the United States and Western European countries in firearms homicide than in non-gun homicide. The American firearm homicide rate is 4.96 times higher than the average rate in eighteen Western European countries, but its non-gun homicide rate is only 1.96 times higher than the European rate.15 While this data lends some support for the existence of a greater propensity to violence in the United States independent of firearms, the only plausible explanation of the far greater disparity in firearms homicide is that the prevalence of guns is itself a significant causal factor.

Most recent, international gun control meta study flows aff Beauchamp 2016:

(Zack Beauchamp. Februrary 29, 2016. Vox World. <http://www.vox.com/2016/2/29/11120184/gun-control-study-international-evidence>. Editor of ThinkProgress Ideas. A huge international study of gun control finds strong evidence that it actually works.)

What do we really know about the research on whether gun restrictions help reduce gun deaths? Even for PhDs, this is a difficult question. There's been a mountain of research on the subject, but these dozens of studies conducted over many years and in many different countries reach a broad and sometimes contradictory range of conclusions. It's hard to know what it really tells us, taken together, about whether gun laws can reduce gun violence. **A just-released study**, published in the February issue of [Epidemiologic Reviews](https://epirev.oxfordjournals.org/content/38/1/140.full.pdf+html), seeks to resolve this problem. It **systematically reviewed** the **evidence from around the world on gun laws and gun violence**, looking to see if the best studies come to similar conclusions. It is the first such study to look at the international researchin this way. The authors are careful to note that their findings do not conclusively prove that gun restrictions reduce gun deaths. However, they did find a compelling trend whereby **new restrictions on gun purchasing and ownership tended to be followed by a decline in gun deaths.** "Across countries, instead of seeing an increase in the homicide rate, we saw a reduction," Julian Santaella-Tenorio, a doctoral student in epidemiology at Columbia University and the study's lead author, told me. Santaella-Tenorio's **study** (co-authored with Columbia professors Magdalena Cerdá and Sandro Galea, as well as the University of North Carolina's Andrés Villaveces) **examined** roughly **130 studies that had been conducted in 10 different countries**. Each of those 130 studies had looked at some specific change in gun laws and its effect on homicide and/or suicide rates. Most of those 130 studies looked at law changes in the developed world, such as the US, Australia, and Austria. A few looked at gun laws in developing countries, specifically Brazil and South Africa. This isn't, then, a study that compiled its own original data on one specific gun law. It's actually more valuable than that: It's telling us what all the different studies on individual laws say when you examine them put together. So what do Santaella-Tenorio et al. conclude? First, and most importantly, that gun violence declined after countries pass a raft of gun laws at the same time: "The simultaneous implementation of laws targeting multiple firearms restrictions is associated with reductions in firearm deaths," the study finds. This finding doesn't highlight one specific law, like an assault weapon ban, in isolation. There were "so many different kinds of laws," Santaella-Tenorio explains, that it was hard to make good international comparisons on every specific kind of gun restriction. Rather, countries passed big packages of gun laws, which overhauled the nation's firearm code fairly broadly, which all tended to share similar features. According to Santaella-Tenorio, they generally included: Banning "weapons that are actually very powerful," like automatic weapons. "They all implemented background checks." "They all required permits and licenses for purchasing guns." South Africa's comprehensive Firearm Control Act, passed in 2000, contained all these measures. One study found that **firearm** homicides in five major South African cities **decreased by 13.6 percent** per year for the next five years. "**Reductions in nonfirearm homicides were also observed**," Santaella-Tenorio et al. note, "although not as pronounced as the ones observed for firearm homicides." Austria's 1997 firearm law, similarly, required background checks, limited access to powerful firearms, and imposed rules about how gun owners had to store their guns. Santaella-Tenorio reviewed two studies on Austria's 1997 law, both of which found evidence that the law had reduced deaths. According to one of them, firearm homicides went down by 4.8 percent, while suicides went down by 9.9 percent. Australia's 1996 [National Firearms Agreement](http://www.vox.com/2015/8/27/9212725/australia-buyback) (which outright confiscated 650,000 guns, in addition to imposing background checks and licensing rules) is perhaps the best-studied of any of the international laws. Santaella-Tenorio et al. reviewed eight studies on it, most of which found clear and strong evidence of a reduction in firearm deaths after the law's passage. One study, for example, compared the Australian state of Victoria to others around the country. Victoria had passed a raft of firearm restrictions in 1988, so the NFA didn't change policy there that much. But firearm deaths went down countrywide by an average of 14 percent in other states relative to Victoria, suggesting that the NFA provisions specifically had made the difference. Santaella-Tenorio and his co-authors also found evidence that specific laws, such as background checks and rules on storage, reduced specific kinds of gun deaths. "**Laws restricting the purchase** of (e.g., background checks) and access to (e.g., safer storage) firearms," they write, "**are** also **associated with lower rates of intimate partner homicides** **and** firearm **unintentional deaths** in children, respectively." Santaella-Tenorio and his colleagues included the United States in their overall review, of course. They found something interesting here too: Generally speaking, **there's strong consensus that restricting access to guns tends to reduce gun deaths**. One study, for example, looked at Missouri's 2007 repeal of its law requiring a permit to purchase a firearm (essentially, it had reduced background check requirements). This study found that after 2007, Missouri's homicide rate jumped by 25 percent. [No other changes in law or circumstance](http://www.realclearpolicy.com/blog/2014/02/17/whats_the_matter_with_the_missouri_murder_rate_841.html) appear to be able to explain the increase. By contrast, laws favored by the National Rifle Association (such as concealed carry or stand your ground), when implemented, either had no effect on gun deaths or increased gun violence. And Santaella-Tenorio found this by considering not just studies that reached this conclusion, but also studies that supported loosening gun laws. Most of the studies that supported these laws were written by a handful of authors, like Florida State's Gary Kleck and independent scholar/Fox News columnist John Lott. Scholars who reexamined their conclusions, sometimes even using their own data, generally came to the opposite results. For instance, a study by Lott and the University of Georgia's David Mustard found that laws permitting concealed carry reduced homicides in states and counties that passed them. However, a subsequent study that reexamined the same data found no effect, and that Lott and Mustard had used flawed statistical procedures in examining the data. Another Lott study found that castle doctrine laws — laws that eliminate the legal duty to retreat before using deadly force, but only in your home — reduced homicides by 9 percent. But a second study came to the opposite conclusion, finding an uptick in homicides after states passed such laws. A third study looking at stand-your-ground laws — which go beyond castle doctrine in eliminating retreat duties outside the home as well — also found an uptick in deaths. Santaella-Tenorio summarize: "Stand your ground laws were associated with a 6.8% increase in homicide rates, mainly driven by increments (14.7%) in homicide rates among white males." The point, then, is that the **pro-gun studies tended to be outliers in the literature**, and were not supported by the most rigorous available analysis.

Outweighs on time frame, scope of countries studied and meta analysis which means that my authors take your evidence into account and still affirm.

Gun laws spill over to change cultural assumptions that cause gun violence.

LaFolette 2000:

. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Al- though I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For **one crucial difference between** European and American **cultures is the** widespread **presence of guns**. **Each culture is the way it is**, at least in part, **because of the role of guns** (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. Therefore, **curtailing the private possession of guns might** well **change the American culture so that it would be less violent**. Consequently, it is not only that fewer guns would directly cause some decline in violent crimes — which it should. It is also likely to reshape the **cultural values** which**, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America.**

Supercharges aff solvency to solve for other crimes as well since it solves the root cause of the violent mindset.

The most comprehensive study which takes evidence from all 50 states into account proves that gun laws reduce gun violence.

AP 2013:

AP March 6, 2013

(50 State Study: More Gun Laws, Fewer Deaths. CBS News. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/50-state-study-more-gun-laws-fewer-deaths/>)

Overall, **states with the most laws had a 42 percent lower gun death rate** than states with the least number of laws. The results are based on **an analysis of 2007-2010 gun-related homicides** **and suicides** from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. **The researchers** also **used data** on gun controlmeasures **in all 50 states** compiled by the Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence, a well-known gun control advocacy group. They compared states by dividing them into four equal-sized groups according to the number of gun laws. [Bipartisan group of senators unveils gun trafficking bill](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bipartisan-group-of-senators-unveils-gun-trafficking-bill" \t "_blank) [Father of slain Sandy Hook child pleads for gun control](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/father-of-slain-sandy-hook-child-pleads-for-gun-control" \t "_blank) The results were published online Wednesday in the medical journal JAMA Internal Medicine. More than 30,000 people nationwide die from guns every year nationwide, and there's evidence that gun-related violent crime rates have increased since 2008, a journal editorial noted. During the four-years studied, there were nearly 122,000 gun deaths, 60 percent of them suicides. "Our motivation was really to understand what are the interventions that can be done to reduce firearm mortality," said Dr. Eric Fleegler, the study's lead author and an emergency department pediatrician and researcher at Boston Children's Hospital. He said his study suggests but doesn't prove that **gun laws** — or something else — **led to fewer gun deaths**. Fleegler is also among hundreds of doctors who have signed a petition urging President Barack Obama and Congress to pass gun safety legislation, a campaign organized by the advocacy group Doctors for America. Gun rights advocates have argued that strict gun laws have failed to curb high murder rates in some cities, including Chicago and Washington, D.C. Fleegler said his study didn't examine city-level laws, while gun control advocates have said **local laws aren't as effective when neighboring states have lax laws**. Previous research on the effectiveness of gun laws has had mixed results, and it's a "very challenging" area to study, said Dr. Daniel Webster, director of the Johns Hopkins Center For Gun Policy. He was not involved in the current study. The strongest kind of research would require comparisons between states that have dissimilar gun laws but otherwise are nearly identical, "but there isn't a super nice twin for New Jersey," for example, a state with strict gun laws, Webster noted Fleegler said his study's conclusions took into account factors also linked with gun violence, including poverty, education levels and race, which vary among the states. The average annual gun death rate ranged from almost 3 per 100,000 in Hawaii to 18 per 100,000 in Louisiana. Hawaii had 16 gun laws, and along with New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts was among states with the most laws and fewest deaths**. States with the fewest laws and most deaths included Alaska, Kentucky, Louisiana and Oklahoma**.

Prefer:

1. The study looks at all 50 states so it correctly analyzes the effect that federal legislation would have.
2. Your indicts assume that neighboring states still allow guns, so they don’t apply to the aff.
3. The study compares all kinds of gun laws, whereas yours is specific to concealed carry or right to carry, so it’s more accurate.

The most recent study proves that gun bans reduce violent crime.

Anuja et al 2014:

Across the basic seven Index I crime categories, the strongest evidence of a statistically significant effect would be for aggravated assault, with 11 of 28 **estimates suggest**ing that **RTC laws increase** this **crime** at the .10 confidence level. An omitted variable bias test on our preferred Table 8a results suggests that our estimated 8 percent increase in aggravated assaults from RTC laws may understate the true harmful impact of RTC laws on aggravated assault, which may explain why this finding is only significant at the .10 level in many of our models. Our analysis of the year-by- year impact of RTC laws also suggests that RTC laws increase aggravated assaults. Our analysis of admittedly imperfect gun aggravated assaults provides suggestive evidence that **RTC laws may be associated with large increases in** this **crime**, perhaps **increasing** such **gun assaults by** almost **33 percent**. In addition to aggravated assault, the most plausible state models conducted over the entire 1979-2010 period provide evidence that **RTC laws increase rape and robbery** (but usually only at the .10 level). In contrast, for the period from 1999-2010 (which seeks to remove the confounding influence of the crack cocaine epidemic), the preferred state model (for those who accept the Wolfers proposition that one should not control for state trends) yields statistically significant evidence for only one crime – suggesting that **RTC laws increase the rate of** **murder** at the .05 significance level. It will be worth exploring whether other methodological approaches and/or additional years of data will confirm the results of this panel-data analysis and clarify some of the highly sensitive results and anomalies (such as the occasional estimates that RTC laws lead to higher rates of property crime) that have plagued this inquiry for over a decade.

Prefer:

1. Outweighs on recency, newer studies are more likely to correct for methodological problems with others, take changing cultural trends into account and take existing data into account to come to their conclusion.
2. Time frame- takes data from over 30 years into account
3. The study controls for incarceration and police which others do not.

# Underviews

# Add-ons

### Cap Add-on

#### Guns cause individualism and neoliberalism. Graham 14:

(Levi Joseph Graham. RURAL LEGENDS: WHITE HETERO-SETTLER MASCULNITY, NEOLIBERAL IDEOLOGY, AND HEGEMONY IN THE HEARTLAND. The University of British Colombia. August 2014. https://open.library.ubc.ca/media/stream/pdf/24/1.0074369/1)

**The valorization of the gun**, its association with settler history, and its status as a symbol of dominance in rural spaces, **still resonates with many men**. Critical research on settler nationalism also illustrates how many spaces in the United States maintain conventional notions of American ‘pride and patriotism’ are rooted in colonial discourses, masculinist viewpoints, and reactionary conservatism (Hixson 2013, Smith 2012, 2006, Cramer 2006, Olster 2004, Zinn 2003). Several **participants** **performed** **this sense of ‘American Pride’ by noting an acute distrust of ‘the government,’** often pointing to gun control, paying taxes, precarious employment situations, and restrictions placed on Christianity being taught in schools as ‘unfair,’ ‘not right,’ and ‘discrimination.’ A review of past literature shows that **notions of white male victimization are quite prevalent when men seek to justify the oppressive and marginalizing practices they engage in** (McIntosh 2003, Kimmel and Ferber 2000, Goveia and Roussaeu 1995). 233 Allegations of persecution, while simultaneously claiming innocence and disaffiliation from the privileges and benefits of interlocking systems of white male supremacy, have also been noted by many critical scholars, and were present in many conversations in Southeast Kansas (Smith 2012, Jiwani 2006, Razack 1998, Collins 1991). One 68-year-old participant named Hank aptly summed up the widespread disillusionment and sense of vicitmization some men feel when he stated: …**I pay my fair share of taxes, and that is my hard earned money.** I busted my ass for it and I need to feed my family with it. I don’t think it should be given to some lazy freeloaders on welfare who are working the system looking for a handout. **And the same people taking our money are the ones saying we shouldn’t have guns**. I just don’t get it – it’s even in our Constitution – we have the right to bear arms, its what the founding fathers wrote wanted our country to be, free to do what we want, and owning guns is a part of that freedom. They were also looking to freely practice their Christian beliefs - that’s why they came over here. And now you see ‘under God’ being taken out of the pledge of allegiance, you see the 10 commandments being removed from schools, you see abortion being legalized and said it is okay to do …it’s all connected. **Obama and people running the government are trying to make America socialist: they are trying to take our guns**, take our money, and make schools more anti-Christian. Don’t get me wrong**, I love my country, but I don’t trust the government**. **The emphasis on being a liberal subject, or being ‘individuals who are free to fail or succeed’** as described by one participant, thus **serves as an influential force** for many men in the 234 community. Such **subjectivities of classic liberalism**, particularly when infused with currents of fundamentalist Christianity, **do not come without repercussion**. **As Foucault** (1998, 1988) **emphasized** **in his** comprehensive **analysis of** technologies of the self and **biopower**, **nothing is more suited to** be subjected to **power than extreme individualism**. Illustration 18: ‘I bet abortion kills more people per year than guns do.’ (A 34-year-old participant commenting on gun violence and a billboard on the town’s main highway.) **As a result of these processes of individualization**, **and given that they are founded upon the United States’ historical pillars** of colonialism, capitalism, nationalism, and religious conservatism, **people are positioned as subjects who in perceiving themselves as ‘individuals**,’ **are** paradoxically much **more likely to** unknowingly **submit to manipulation**, conformity, and obedience. The religious surveillance that regulates the actions, practices, and perspectives of the area reduces social relations (as well as the decisions people make in their lives) to individual choices that are persistently described as ‘good or bad’ or ‘right or wrong.’ 235 One major aspect of being an individual in Southeast Kansas is tied to citizenship and nationalistic belonging. Ironically, in expressing their independent liberal-sense-of-the-self several participants spoke at length about having a shared collective identity of being ‘American.’ Many stated being proud of the country’s religious heritage, proud of the United States standing as a ‘military superpower,’ and ultimately, ‘proud to be American.’ Numerous participants also gave glowing accounts of American history, and described the perceived Christian values and imperialistic practices of the ‘country’s forefathers’ as ‘patriotic,’ ‘visionary,’ ‘fair’ and ‘good.’ Such accounts can readily be seen in the comments of a 30-year-old named Billy, who when asked to describe his thoughts on the history of gun use in the area, stated: Well, the missionaries and priests came here to help people – they built the church, started educating people, and shared their way of life. Then, when others started arriving they basically were here to do the same, I’m sure the guns they had were mainly for protection and hunting. And its still like that to this day - guys know each other, we know our neighbors, our families get along, and overall, we have a safe, tight-knit community. It’s a great place to raise children and have a family. Its what our country was founded on. The pioneers that came over here were not be treated too well, they were looking for freedom, and they needed guns to protect themselves from some of the Indians, or other criminals, that would attack them. And I know not all the Indians were dangerous, but you can’t say that some innocent people were not attacked. Our ancestors were looking for a place to be free, work hard, and own some land to live off of. You can’t fault a guy for that… 236 When we got here its not like the Indians were all living peacefully with each other anyway – just look at the history, it’s a fact. There were tribes stealing and attacking other tribes, and if you look at how big the country is I think they (Indians) could have done a better job of living with each other. It wasn’t like it was some paradise before our Founding Fathers got here. In the end, pioneers were protecting their families and defending what they believed in… Several scholars have noted how **the symbol of the gun is conspicuously entwined in the United States’ historical tapestr**y (Brown 2008, Cramer 2006, Wright 2001 Slotkin 1992). As reflected in Billy’s account above, **the perceived threat of aggression and hostility from Indigenous people** on the vast, open plains **meant that** from its genesis, **America** was a society that **depended upon** **a populace that was heavily armed** (Cornell 2006). Consequently, **this** endorsement for, and **normalization of, gun use** would have significant impacts not only upon material Indigenous-settler relations, but it **would** also **affect the discursive formations associated with masculinity** as well. Frontier Masculinity Recently, scholars have theorized upon the creation of ‘frontier masculinity’ that features prominently in the gendered narratives reinforcing American nationalism (Via 2010, Melzner 2009). Oftentimes, these ‘**frontier masculinities’ rely upon guns as signifiers of manhood.** **There** also **continues to be a growing body of literature noting the significance** that **guns have as emblems of power, security, and self-reliance,** and how such representations shore up glorified fabrications of white settlers coming to conquer the frontier (Carrington, McIntosh, and Scott 2010, Via 2010, Melzner 2009). Relating to these invented 237 historical constructions, it was not uncommon to hear participants fondly tell stories of playing ‘Cowboys and Indians,’ or pretending to be characters from their favourite war movies and popular Westerns. Many recalled with sentimental nostalgia the fun times they had growing up playing with toy guns pretending to embody the wholesome qualities that their cowboys idols and war heroes stood for in protecting and defending the nation. Illustration 19: ‘We use them (guns) to salute our vets, pay honour to those who died defending our country and protecting our freedom …part of that freedom is allowing a guy to own a gun – its in our constitution’ (A 57-year-old participant commenting on a photo of a Memorial Day Mass with ceremonial gun salute at a local cemetery.) Critical scholarship also points out that settler myths of national defense and safeguarding property are linked to historical notions of Manifest Destiny, as well as ‘discovering the New World’ and ‘spreading civilization’ through homesteading, establishing churches, and the assimilation and elimination of ‘backward Indians’ (Smith 2012, 2006, Via 2010, Cornell 2006, Smith 2006). Such discourses of destiny and defense are particularly 238 interesting given recent research that shows that the promotion of gun ownership for the purposes of ‘safety’ contradictorily ends up eroding away at a society’s sense of security (Cornell 2006). This paradox can be observed due to the fact that as gun possession rates rise in communities, so does fear and suspicion (Cornell 2006). The proliferation of **guns** may end up reducing the peace of mind they are meant to offer because they **create a more defensive and heavily armed assortment of atomized individuals who are** often **governed by mistrust and doubt,** rather than by their own free will as they claim to be. Nonetheless, numerous participants stated that the reasons they owned guns was for ‘safety and protection.’ Despite the semantics that many participants used as being part of a ‘safe’ community, alternative perspectives regarding Southeast Kansas’ past suggests otherwise. The benevolent Christian narratives that dominate the history of the area, when analyzed from a decolonial perspective; show that ‘safe’ may not necessarily be the most accurate descriptor of the region. Such contradictions can be recognized due to the lack of Indigenous histories and accounts of the region’s past, the chronological attempts at cultural assimilation and displacement that took place locally, and the fact that when the research was taking place less than .03 percent of the county population identified as Native American (United States Census Bureau). Given this information, it is readily apparent that the local community has been primarily exposed to masculinist narratives of colonial white supremacy on both institutional and cultural levels, and has also underwent the massive dislocation of Indigenous people since settlement began. Consequently, the configuration of practices and discourses that exist for men in the region reproduce social hierarchies along the lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, and ability. 239 Good Guys versus Bad Guys In looking at the social hierarchies that operate in Southeast Kansas, I once again borrow from Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity that suggests that the discourses surrounding manhood in particular local contexts produce marginalized, subordinated, and complicit masculinities (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Given the particular (local) version of hegemonic masculinity that permeates most spaces in the area; one of white, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied, citizens; such marginalizing and subordinating processes can be readily observed in the discourses of everyday interactions. Several scholars have noted that **processes of ‘othering’** and the politics of alterity that exist in settler societies **predominantly take place along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality;** thereby reinforcing structural white, male, supremacy **(**Pease 2010a, Razack 2002, Tuhiwai Smith 1999, hooks 1989, Mohanty 1984).

#### Appeals to the US Constitution are the most common justification for gun rights; they guarantee the protection of private property, further entrenching capitalism. Gun control breaks down the right to bear arms, diminishing the power of private property. Iancu [“Review: The Constitutional Protection of Capitalism,” Bogdan Iancu, Faculty of Political Science, University of Bucharest. March 2011. <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/lpbr/subpages/reviews/nicol0311.htm>]

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF CAPITALISM is an ambitious title, which makes a worthy academic promise by posing a foundational question. The theoretical fathers of modern constitutionalism viewed property as a pre-political right attached to personality. Locke’s argument in the SECOND TREATISE, where ‘estate,’ life, and liberty are analytically on the same par and inextricably interlinked is the classic example. Consequently, protecting property from public interference as a matter of principle meant respecting personal dignity and safeguarding natural individual and –incidentally-- societal autonomy against the state. Even censitary suffrage was justified in an essentially individualistic-meritocratic key: holding a certain amount of property was perceived to reflect both a “rough index of capacity, stability, and good will in the individual” (Pitkin 1967, p.191) and the best indicator of independence from undue influence.  Actual legal arrangements (constitutional law) mirrored the philosophical presuppositions of limited government (constitutionalism). Classical systems guaranteed property protections as a matter of foremost principle, with the federal US Constitution of 1787 as the harbinger and preeminent example. By the same token, the defense of property against political encroachments regarded as illegitimate by constitutional default conferred upon public law an ancillary character. Just as the classical liberal state was the accessory of society, classical constitutional law was in effect “the accessory of private law” (Grimm 1987, p.195).

#### The individual right to handgun possession specifically props up the capitalist system. The gun industry has been a long-lasting source of profit, generating billions of dollars for the bourgeoisie. Younge [“America’s deadly devotion to guns,” Gary Younge, Staff Writer. The Guardian/Taipei Times. April 22, 2012. <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2012/04/22/2003530948>]

The Second Amendment to the US constitution reads: “A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.” There has long been a dispute about whether “the people” described refers to individuals or the individual states, but there is no disagreement about its broader intent, which is to provide the constitutional means to mount a military defense against a tyrannical government. “It’s about independence and freedom,” explains NRA member David Britt. “When you have a democratic system and an honorable people then you trust the citizens.” Britt, an affable man in his 60s, does not lend himself easily to caricature. Elsewhere in the room, one T-shirt quotes Thessalonians 3:10 (“If any would not work neither should he eat”) on the back and “I hate welfare” on the front. Another T-shirt announces: “Christian, American, Heterosexual, Pro-Gun, Conservative. Any Questions?” Britt is more understated, conservative and more likely to water at the mouth talking about barbecue in his native Memphis than foam at the mouth over a Fox News talking point. He does not fetishize guns, but fondly recalls his grandfather giving him his first rifle when he was seven. “He said it’s not a toy and he showed me how to use it properly,” he said. Britt believes individual gun ownership is a guarantor of democracy. “In Europe they cede their rights and freedoms to their governments, but we think the government should be subservient to us,” he added. For all the right-wing demagoguery associated with the NRA, this is quite a radical notion. The trouble is that, left in the hands of individuals, each gets to define their own version of tyranny and potentially undermine democracy with their firearms. Some believe the healthcare law enacted by the democratically elected US Congress is tyrannical. In the hardscrabble town of Pahrump, Nevada, in 2010, I witnessed a conversation between conservatives about the most propitious moment to militarily challenge this government. “The last thing we want to see is to break out our arms,” one said. “But we need to have them in hand, and the government needs to know that we will use [our arms] if they continue down the path they’re on.” The Second Amendment is not the only factor that embeds guns in the US’ culture. As a settler nation that had to both impose and maintain its domination over indigenous people to acquire and defend land and feed itself in a frontier state, the gun made the US, as we understand it today, possible. “None of us in the free world would have what we have if it were not for guns,” Britt says. “It’s about freedom, it’s not about violence.” Missouri representative Jeanette Oxford, who represents a district in St Louis, disagrees. “From the outset violence was enforced with weapons of various kinds in North America,” she says. “I think the ability to enforce your right through might is ingrained in us.” It is also an important component of something else that is central to US society: capitalism. Guns make money. A lot of it. Since 1990 the sale of legal guns alone has come to, on average, about US$3.5 billion every year. And it is recession-proof, rising and falling less with the economic tide than the electoral one. When Democrats are elected the sales go up, and when a black Democrat is elected, they skyrocket. The week US President Barack Obama was elected gun sales leaped 50 percent against the previous year, and they have continued to rise sharply.

### General Reps Focus Bad

#### Excessive reps focus hurts liberalism.

Chait 15 Jonathan Chait (commentator and writer for New York magazine. He was previously a senior editor at The New Republic and a former assistant editor of The American Prospect. He writes a periodic column in the Los Angeles Times) “How the language police are perverting liberalism.” NY Magazine January 275h 2015 <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/01/not-a-very-pc-thing-to-say.html>

Or maybe not. The p.c. style of politics has one serious, possibly fatal drawback: It is exhausting. Claims of victimhood that are useful within the left-wing subculture may alienate much of America. The movement’s dour puritanism can move people to outrage, but it may prove ill suited to the hopeful mood required of mass politics. Nor does it bode well for the movement’s longevity that many of its allies are worn out. “It seems to me now that the public face of social liberalism has ceased to seem positive, joyful, human, and freeing,” confessed the progressive writer Freddie deBoer. “There are so many ways to step on a land mine now, so many terms that have become forbidden, so many attitudes that will get you cast out if you even appear to hold them. I’m far from alone in feeling that it’s typically not worth it to engage, given the risks.” Goldberg wrote recently about people “who feel emotionally savaged by their involvement in [online feminism] — not because of sexist trolls, but because of the slashing righteousness of other feminists.” Former Feministing editor Samhita Mukhopadhyay told her, “Everyone is so scared to speak right now.”¶ That the new political correctness has bludgeoned even many of its own supporters into despondent silence is a triumph, but one of limited use. Politics in a democracy is still based on getting people to agree with you, not making them afraid to disagree. The historical record of political movements that sought to expand freedom for the oppressed by eliminating it for their enemies is dismal. The historical record of American liberalism, which has extended social freedoms to blacks, Jews, gays, and women, is glorious. And that glory rests in its confidence in the ultimate power of reason, not coercion, to triumph.

### Fem Offense

#### Guns Bad

**Gun possession is inherently masculine. Men glorify firearms as integral to their gendered traditions. Bassin** [“Why Packing a Pistol Perpetuates Patriarchy,” Alana Bassin, trial lawyer. *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*. Vol. 8, No. 2, Fall, 1997.]

Firearms are a source of male domination-a symbol of male power and aggression.8 First, the gun is phallic.9 Just as sex is the ultimate weapon of patriarchy used to penetrate and possess women,10 the gun's sole purpose is to intrude and wound its victim. Historically, men have used guns to conquer and dominate other peoples. 11 European men first developed small arms between the Fourteenth and Sixteenth centuries for use in warfare. 12 By the 1600s, guns were a common weapon of war for soldiers in Europe.13 In Colonial America, every male serving in the militia was required to carry a gun.14 Today, firearms and missiles are the backbone of the modern military, arguably America's most patriarchal institution.15 Beyond war, guns also have played a significant role in perpetuating patriarchy. During the slave trade, men traded firearms in Africa for slaves. 16 At common law, guns were used to protect a man's home and all his possessions, including his wife. In the private sphere, the gun is passed down from father to son for hunting, a sport that continues to be a "rite of passage" for many young males. Even in today's media, movies and television glorify "guns and guys," often employing gun showdowns between the "good guys" and the "bad guys" as their focal point.

**The idea handguns would be an effective equalizer for subjugated women is a farce. As long as gun possession is permitted, it will be taken advantage of by men so as to further dominate women. Bassin (3)** [“Why Packing a Pistol Perpetuates Patriarchy,” Alana Bassin, trial lawyer. *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*. Vol. 8, No. 2, Fall, 1997.]

For victims of domestic violence, the freedom to purchase a gun also can be lethal. In the United States, domestic violence is the leading cause of injury for women between the ages of 15-44.49 Between 2-4 million incidents of domestic violence occur each year. Of those, an estimated 150,000 are gun-related. Where there is a gun at home, women subjected to one incident of physical abuse at home are almost five times more likely to be murdered or fatally shot in a later instance of physical abuse.52 An Atlanta study about domestic violence involving guns found that death was twelve times as likely to occur. Overwhelmingly, it was women who died. 53 Therefore, although the option to buy a gun exists in society, buying guns is not an answer to violence in the United States, nor is it the answer to women's safety concerns. On the contrary, fewer guns and stronger gun control laws statistically have proven to be more effective.

#### Domestic Violence

Guns for self-defense increase potential for domestic violence. Bonderman 95:

Armed bv Fear: Self-Defkse Handguns and Women’s Health Judith Bonderman, JD, MPH Director Advocacy for Victims of Gun Violence Clinic The Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law Washington, D.C. 1995.

From 1976 to 1987, more than twice as many American women were shot and killed by their husbands, ex-husbands, or boyfriends as were murdered by strangers’i Similarly, more than **two-thirds of all nonfatal crimes** of violence (rape, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault) **against women were committed by spouses**, family or acquaintances, according to a Department of Justice analysis of 400,000 interviews of crime victims from 1987 to 1991. The average annual rate of female nonfatal victimizations by intimates, family members, and acquaintances was 14.1 per 1,000, compared with 5.4 per 1,000 for incidents in which the offender was a stranger. Females were more than 10 times more likely than men to be victimized by a spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. Only 5% of all violent victimizations against men were family related.12 Earlier Department of Justice studies of violent crime by strangers and nonstrangers had comparable findings. A 1987 report found that most of the violent crimes by strangers (70%) were committed against males, and most crimes by relatives (77%) were committed against females. This study also found that only 4% of stranger to stranger incidents (male or female) occurred inside the victim’s home, compared with 18% of crimes by acquaintances and 58% of crimes by relatives.i3 Will the gun kept in the home for self-defense against strangers protect against the much greater threat of domestic violence? Possibly. But **women who own firearms will** just as likely **end up facing a greater danger from their intimate partners**. **A gun in the home is** theoretically **accessible to all** who live there and can be used against its owner as well as by her. In a 1992 study, Linda Saltzman and colleagues at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention looked at the risk of death and nonfatal injury during family and intimate assaults and found that **firearm-associated family and intimate assaults were 12 times more likely to be fatal** than those not associated with firearms. l4 In a recent case-control study, Dr. Kellermann and colleagues at the Emory Center for Injury Prevention found that having a gun in the home was a significant risk factor for homicide. **Households with guns were 7.8 times more likely to have a firearm homicide at the hands of a family member or intimate acquaintance** than homes without guns. The use of illicit drugs and alcohol was also an important independent risk factor for homicide in the home, as was a history of prior domestic violence.i5

#### Second Amendment Bad

**Appeals to the Second Amendment as permitting handgun possession also devalue feminine identity. By being ratified in a patriarchal setting, it failed to take into account the unique perspectives of women. Bassin (2)** [“Why Packing a Pistol Perpetuates Patriarchy,” Alana Bassin, trial lawyer. *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*. Vol. 8, No. 2, Fall, 1997.]

The Second Amendment itself disregards women. Most notably, the language legitimizing the right to bear arms refers specifically to a "well regulated militia," [was] an institution that did not include women. Additionally, [And,] the Second Amendment was ratified by men at a time when women had no legitimate voice in society. In interpreting the Constitution, scholars and judges often rely on the framers' intent.24 Because none of the framers were women, women's views and voices were never heard. As a result, the absence of a female view during the creation of the right to bear arms critically impacts society.

#### AT Empowerment

And, **perceptions of empowerment through handgun possession are constructs of the fear tactics of the gun industry in deceiving women to accept patriarchal traditions. Bassin (4)** [“Why Packing a Pistol Perpetuates Patriarchy,” Alana Bassin, trial lawyer. *Hastings Women’s Law Journal*. Vol. 8, No. 2, Fall, 1997.]

The NRA and gun manufacturers have capitalized on the violence in the United States, and although some women [that] perceive buying guns as empowering, these women have actually become victims of marketing campaigns and fear tactics. First, in the late 1980s, the gun industry, realizing the male gun market was saturated, focused on women as a new focus group. 4 In the name of feminism and motherhood, the gun industry and the NRA aggressively pursued their new consumers: women, aged 25-40, mostly professionals, with a median income of $55,000.55 Then, in February 1989, Smith and Wesson produced the Lady Smith,Tm a handgun designed for women. According to them, it is elegant yet practical.56 Soon after, a large number of gun advertisements focused on societal violence toward women, most often "stranger danger." 57 Advertisements headlined phrases such as: "Things that go bump in the night aren't always your imagination ... .,5,8; "You thought no one could fit in your back seat ....9; 59 and "Self-protection is more than your right... it's your responsibility," with a picture of a mother tucking her child into bed.6 The NRA's advertisements were similar, with headlines such as: "Should you shoot a rapist before he cuts your throat?," and "He's followed you for two weeks. He'll rape you in two minutes. Who Cares?" 61 The gun industry capitalized on women's fears by stressing the danger of rapists, stalkers, and burglars. Yet violence against women is generally not committed by "strangers in the night" but by known acquaintances. 62 More than twice as many women are shot and killed by their husbands or lovers than by strangers, 63 leaving only a small percentage of violent crime victims who successfully use a gun to defend themselves against strangers.64 Ironically, [And,] while gun advertisements emphasized the need for a woman to have a gun for safety, gunmakers gave little concern to ensure safe gun use.65 In a qualitative analysis examining 125 gun magazines and twenty advertisements, statistics showed that none of the advertisements expressly mentioned any need for a woman to seek training in how to use a gun and only 20-25% discussed safety features or safety equipment. 66 Nothing in the advertisements emphasized a need for women to learn safe gun posture, how to load and unload ammunition, or how to operate a gun and store it.67 Unfortunately, research among women shows that they feel secure simply from gun ownership.68 There is little concern for learning proper gun care.69 Considering the lethal nature of a gun and the high number of accidents occurring because of improper gun use, it is peculiar that the gun industry, which purports to be an advocate for women's safety, does not advertise the need for education in gun operation and use.

#### Courts Solve

Next, **women victims of sexual violence do not have to rely on handguns for their protection. There are two non-violent alternatives-**

The first is protective orders. Protective orders are empirically proven to decrease domestic abuse. Klein ‘9 [Klein, Andrew. US Department of Justice. 2009. "Practical Implications of Current Domestic Violence Research."]

First, in terms of their effectiveness in deterring repeat abuse, before and after studies suggest that protective orders may deter certain abusers. In Travis County, Texas, over a period of two years before and after order issuance, physical abuse dropped from 68 percent to 23 percent after the orders were obtained, if victims maintained the order. If the abusers were also arrested at the time of the order issuance, the physical abuse diminished further; if they had children, it diminished less. [26] These studies cannot reveal whether or not the abuse would have naturally declined overtime without the orders because, for example, the victims are more likely to have left their abusers when they obtained the orders.

**The second is domestic violence courts. Domestic violence courts are better than regular courts in 7 ways.** Klein (2) [Klein, Andrew. US Department of Justice. 2009. "Practical Implications of Current Domestic Violence Research."]

A 2004 study found 160 jurisdictions across the country with specialized domestic violence courts. The majority of these courts had the following traits in common: (1) effective management of domestic violence cases, coordinating all of the cases involving the relevant parties and integrating requisite information for the court; (2) specialized intake and court staffing for domestic violence cases; (3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims by court staff, often assisted by related specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; (4) court processes to ensure victims' safety (e.g., court metal detectors, separate waiting rooms, specialized orders and victim referrals; (5) increased court monitoring and enforcement of batterer compliance with court orders, often exercised by specialized probation supervision units; (6) consideration of any children involved in the domestic violence; and (7) enhanced domestic violence training for judges.

And, **domestic violence courts greatly decrease reoffending.** Klein (3) [Klein, Andrew. US Department of Justice. 2009. "Practical Implications of Current Domestic Violence Research."]

Although relatively new, some research shows that specialized domestic violence courts are associated with decreased reoffending and reabuse. The reduction may be due to reforms of court processes or a corresponding specialization of domestic violence prosecution and/or probation supervision, or all three. A study of Milwaukee‟s federally funded domestic violence court found that the number of arrests were halved for domestic violence defendants sentenced to probation, compared to those sentenced to probation before court reform. The rearrest rate dropped from 8 percent to 4.2 percent. The average number of new arrests also dropped significantly. Researchers posited that one of the prime explanations for the drop was a corresponding rise in the use of incarceration as a sentence. As a result of tight judicial monitoring and enforcement of release conditions, the [average] post-reform probationers spent 13,902 days confined, compared to the 1,059 daysprobationers spent jailed in the days before court reform. In other words, those sentenced by the special domestic violence court had less time on the streets to reabuse and reoffend. [104]

#### Rights Bad

**Individual rights maintain patriarchy on a systemic level. Marshall**  [“Review Essay: Feminist reconstructions of universalism and the discourse of human rights,” Jill Marshall, International Journal of Law in Context, 5,1 pp. 87–92 (2009) Cambridge University Press doi:10.1017/S1744552309005059 Printed in the United Kingdom]

Some feminists, particularly radical feminists, argue that the social structures in which rights operate are made to seem permanent and often ‘natural’. According to these arguments, such structural constraints are in fact contingent and changeable. Making people think they have rights therefore undermines the possibility of radical transformation of the structural constraints. According to this view, rights oversimplify and reinforce structural inequalities of power by protecting the most privileged. They are a creature of states and a function of existing configurations of power. As such, they are of limited use to the politically marginalised or for the construction of claims which oppose prevailing power relations. Thus, although rights seem to present humans as equal rights holders, because of inequalities of power already existing in societies, including gender-based ones, this presents an unrealistic, and indeed non-existent, equality.... [Full Text Available] The division between the public world, described as being traditionally male, rational, unemotional, objective, and the private world, correspondingly traditionally female, domestic, emotional, subjective, has meant that international law and human rights law are very much seen to be operating in the public (male) arena, not the private (female) one.10 So in the international arena, [And,] the traditional domain of ‘rights talk’ has focused on [is] what states are doing in terms of violating their citizens’ human rights in the public sphere. In this domain women are disadvantaged because many violations of their rights, particularly those that only, or usually only, happen to women, are invisible because they happen outside the public sphere where there are fewer men to compare them with. As this arena is not traditionally one in which human rights law operates, it usually prevents the abuses that occur there from even being described as human rights issues.

#### **Root Cause**

**Patriarchy is the root cause of all oppression – any form of violence or inequality is inevitably gendered. Harders 11**

Harders 11—director of the Center for North African and Middle Eastern Studies at the Otto-Suhr Institute for Political Sciences at Freie Universität Berlin (Cilja, Gender Relations, Violence and Conflict Transformation, http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/harders\_handbook.pdf)

There is generally little consensus about the root causes of violent conflict among researchers, as men and women have produced a rich and controversial body of thought about the causes of war throughout history (Daase 2003, 176; Sahm et al. 2002; Adolf 2009). There are several strands to this debate. First, wars, as understood in IR theory, can be seen as products of systemic asymmetry and anarchy. In this conception, states are the main actors and the structure of the international system is the main cause of war. Second, anthropological approaches may explain war with the human potential for aggression. Often, they build on biology and even genetics. Third, some actor-orientated approaches propose that human interest in securing power, fighting for political ideologies and economic gain, or fighting social injustice are important drivers of violent conflict. Fourth, a domestic politics argument (by which the internal structure and relations of a state strongly influence its external affairs) expects undemocratic or weak states to be the causes of war. **Feminist thinking has contributed a great deal** of interesting insight in particular to this fourth perspective, **based on analyses of the gendered deficits in the realm of participation and representation**, the organisation of the welfare state, **or the** philosophical **foundations of democracy** (Pateman 1988; Sauer 2009). **Current scholarship supports these arguments with quantitative data**: Mary Caprioli (2005) and Erik Melander (2005), for example, analysed the relationship between state behaviour, gender justice and democracy. **They sustained the feminist claim that the private and the political spheres are as deeply linked as the domestic and the international spheres, and that peaceful domestic gender relations have a positive impact on external state behaviour** (Clasen/Zwingel 2009). **A feminist perspective** hence **systematically links the domestic and the international realm and addresses unjust gender relations as a root cause of violence** (Tickner 1992, 128): “[...] **the achievement of peace, economic justice, and ecological sustainability is inseparable from overcoming** social relations of **domination** and subordination; genuine security requires not only the absence of war but also the elimination of unjust social relations, including unequal gender relations.” In the context of our discussion, violence is mostly thought of in two ways: first, as direct physical violence. The absence of such violence (and the absence of any imminent threat of it) has been called negative peace. Second, there is a much broader range of violence, including structural, symbolic and cultural violence (Hagemann-White 2001). Johan Galtung holds that structural violence exists whenever the potential development of an individual or group is diminished – for example by uneven distribution of power and resources (Galtung 1972; Confortini 2006). The absence of these more indirect, non-physical types of violence is a precondition for realising comprehensive visions of “positive peace”. Within peace research there has been a long and diverse debate about the usefulness and necessity of broader or narrower conceptions of violence (and peace), which cannot be examined in detail here (Moser/Clark 2001; Senghaas 1995; Brock 1995). British peace activist and sociologist Cynthia **Cockburn suggests thinking of violence as a “continuum of violence”** (Cockburn 2004, 43): “[…] **Gender links violence at different points** on a scale reaching **from the personal to the international**, from the home to the back street to the manoeuvres of the tank column and the sortie of the stealth bomber: battering and marital rape, confinement, “dowry” burnings, honour killings, and genital mutilation in peacetime; military rape, sequestration, prostitutions, and sexualized torture in war.” **The idea of a continuum of violence poses some conceptual and practical problems for those aiming to stop or transform it.** Where to start? What are the most urgent types of violence to be addressed? How to define thresholds between different types and degrees of violence? Are there legitimate types of violence? And if so, how can they possibly be legitimised? While these questions cannot be discussed in greater detail here, some preliminary suggestions can be made using Clasen’s “Gendered Peace Index” (Clasen 2006). The Gendered Peace Index measures the degree of peacefulness of a society based on a **process-orientated conception of peace**. This means that **peace is not a given status or defined aim, but has to be continuously created through social processes that are open to change**. Clasen defines three conditions for positive peace, which represent a progression from negative peace (i.e. the absence of war) to a culture of peace. Firstly, a secure physical existence for all men and women (Existenzerhaltung) forms the minimum requirement for peace. This can be measured by a balanced sex-ratio, a low degree of domestic violence, and a low degree of public violence. Secondly, the possibility to live a good life (Existenzentfaltung) must be secured. This can be measured by the degree of gender justice in a society in terms of life expectancy, literacy, schooling, fertility and economic and political participation of women. Thirdly, and most importantly for conflict transformation: a plurality of lifestyles and roles (Rollenpluralismus) forms the last major step towards a culture of peace. This can be measured, for example, by looking at the discrimination of minorities, especially homosexuals, in a society. In light of the discussion so far, it appears that what we need is a multi-causal and multidimensional model of root causes of violence**, which is sensitive to the gendered links between different types of violence and different stages of escalation. Collective and individual violence must be seen as products of gendered social processes** and interactions. Thus, **a gendered theory of society and the state is needed in order to understand (and change) the various social, political and symbolic orders of violence**.

### Biopower Offense

#### Gun ownership promotes rugged individualism that fragments society—that fragmentation is what keeps the community under the control of the state. Debrander 12

Firmin Debrabander “The Freedom of an Armed Society” The New York Times December 16th 2012 <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/16/the-freedom-of-an-armed-society/> JW

Gun rights advocates also argue that guns provide the ultimate insurance of our freedom, in so far as they are the final deterrent against encroaching centralized government, and an executive branch run amok with power. Any suggestion of limiting guns rights is greeted by ominous warnings that this is a move of expansive, would-be despotic government. It has been the means by which gun rights advocates withstand even the most seemingly rational gun control measures. An assault weapons ban, smaller ammunition clips for guns, longer background checks on gun purchases — these are all measures centralized government wants, they claim, in order to exert control over us, and ultimately impose its arbitrary will. I have often suspected, however, that contrary to holding centralized authority in check, broad individual gun ownership gives the powers-that-be exactly what they want. After all, a population of privately armed citizens is one that is increasingly fragmented, and vulnerable as a result. Private gun ownership invites retreat into extreme individualism — I heard numerous calls for homeschooling in the wake of the Newtown shootings — and nourishes the illusion that I can be my own police, or military, as the case may be. The N.R.A. would have each of us steeled for impending government aggression, but it goes without saying that individually armed citizens are no match for government force. The N.R.A. argues against that interpretation of the Second Amendment that privileges armed militias over individuals, and yet it seems clear that armed militias, at least in theory, would provide a superior check on autocratic government. As Michel Foucault pointed out in his detailed study of the mechanisms of power, nothing suits power so well as extreme individualism. In fact, he explains, political and corporate interests aim at nothing less than “individualization,” since it is far easier to manipulate a collection of discrete and increasingly independent individuals than a community. Guns undermine just that — community. Their pervasive, open presence would sow apprehension, suspicion, mistrust and fear, all emotions that are corrosive of community and civic cooperation. To that extent, then, guns give license to autocratic government. Our gun culture promotes a fatal slide into extreme individualism. It fosters a society of atomistic individuals, isolated before power — and one another — and in the aftermath of shootings such as at Newtown, paralyzed with fear. That is not freedom, but quite its opposite. And as the Occupy movement makes clear, also the demonstrators that precipitated regime change in Egypt and Myanmar last year, assembled masses don’t require guns to exercise and secure their freedom, and wield world-changing political force. Arendt and Foucault reveal that power does not lie in armed individuals, but in assembly — and everything conducive to that.

**Biopolitics legitimizes racism and genocide**

Milchman and Rosenberg 5 (Alan and Alan, Both @ Queens College, Review Essay: Michel Foucault: Crises and Problemizations, The Review of Politics vol67 no2, JSTOR) LA

"Society Must Be Defended "culminates in Foucault's chilling ac count of a tendency immanent to bio-politics, a tendency to what he has elsewhere designated as "thanato-politics," and its basis in what he here terms state racism. The question that Foucault raises in his final lecture in this course, is how can mass murder and ex termination become instantiated in a regime of biopower: If it is true that the power of sovereignty is increasingly on the retreat and that disciplinary or regulatory disciplinary power is on the advance, how will the power to kill and the function of murder operate in this technology of power, which takes life as both its object and its objective? ....How, under these conditions, is it possible for a political power to kill, to call for deaths, to demand deaths, to give the order to kill... ?Given that this power's objective is essentially tomake live, how can it let die? How can the power of death, the function of death, be exercised in a political sytem centered upon biopower?(p.254) For Foucault, it is here that racism, which, indeed, has a long history, intervenes, and now becomes inscribed in the basic mechanisms of the modern state. According to Foucault: …broadly speaking, racism justifies the death function in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others makes one biologically stronger insofar as one is amember of a race or a population, insofar as one is an element in a unitary living plurality.... The specificity of modern racism... is not bound up with mentalities, ideologies, or the lies of power. It is bound up with the techniques of power, with the technology of power. We are dealing with a mechanism that allows biopower towork. So racism is bound up with the workings of a state that is obliged to use race, the elimination of races and the purification of the race, to exercise its sovereign power. The juxtaposition of—or the way biopower functions through? the old sovereign power of life and death implies the workings, the introduction and activation of racism. And it is, I think, here that we find the actual roots of racism (p. 258). State racism**, then em**erges, when in a regime of biopower, internal or external threats lead the state to engage in mass death: "Once the State functions in the biopower mode, racism alone can justify the murderous function of the State" (p. 256). But, according to Foucault, what is it that constitutes a group within the population as a "race?" Race is a "way of introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power's control: the break between what must live and what must die" **(p. 254). The basis for such a break in the biological continuum** can be ethnic or religious; it can be founded on sexual orientation, on deviance from a society's norms, on mental or physical illness, or on criminality. Any such "cut" in the continuity of the species can constitute a race in Foucauldian terms, so long as the "identity" in question is meataphysically defined, attributed to the very being of the individual or group. Moreover, the constitution of race entails "... the hierarchy of races, the fact that certain races are described as good and that others, in contrast, are described as inferior: all this is away of fragmenting the field of the biological that power controls.... It is, in short, away of establishing a biological-type caesura within a population that appears in the biological domain" (p. 255). And on the bases of such a caesura, the exclusion or elimination of the inferior race can be undertaken, purportedly in the interests of the life and health of the superior race, those who are normal. Race, for Foucault, is linked to the "dividing practices" through which a population can be regulated and controlled in a bio-political regime**.** The Foucauldian notion of race is a novel one, permitting us to see the numerous ways in which such dividing practices are instantiated in the modern world, as so many manifestations of a racialization of politics, even where there is no necessary genetic basis for the invidious distinctions that it entails. Foucault's analysis of state racism focuses on the Nazi and Stalinist regimes. Nazism is seen as the "paroxysmal" development of the technologies and mechanisms of biopower, while Stalinism has perfected what Foucault terms a "social-racism," in which the state exercises its right to kill or eliminate "class" enemies, the abnormal, and "criminal" elements, no less metaphysically defined than the Jews or "Gypsies" that were the target of the Nazis. Foucault's linkage of state racism and the perpetuation of mass murder to ten dencies immanent to biopower, makes it clear that, for him, regimes such as Nazism and Stalinism are not atavistic reversions to the premodern past, but historically specific manifestations of tenden cies that are also found throughout the modern, democratic, West.

# Frontlines

### States Don’t Link to Ptx

### A2 Constitution

**1. The Second Amendment to The Constitution** [“The Bill of Rights: A Transcription,” National Archives. The Charters of Freedom. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>] **states:**

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

**The preamble to the Amendment and its use of “the people” as a collective noun proves it grants a collective right to possess a gun in military service. Stevens** [“District of Columbia v. Heller: Dissent,” Justice Stevens, Justice Souter, Justice Ginsberg, and Justice Breyer. Supreme Court. June 26th, 2008. <http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/07pdf/07-290.pdf>]

The text of the Second Amendment is brief. It provides: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Three portions of that text merit special focus: the in­ troductory language defining the Amendment’s purpose, the class of persons encompassed within its reach, and the unitary nature of the right that it protects. “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State” The preamble to the Second Amendment makes three important points. It identifies the preservation of the militia as the Amendment’s purpose; it explains that the militia is necessary to the security of a free State; and it recognizes that the militia must be “well regulated.” In all three respects it is comparable to provisions in several State Declarations of Rights that were adopted roughly contemporaneously with the Declaration of Independence. Those state provisions highlight the importance members of the founding generation attached to the maintenance of state militias; they also underscore the profound fear shared by many in that era of the dangers posed by standing armies. While the need for state militias has not been a matter of significant public interest for almost two cen­ turies, that fact should not obscure the contemporary concerns that animated the Framers. The parallels between the Second Amendment and these state declarations, and the Second Amendment’s omission of any statement of purpose related to the right to use firearms for hunting or personal self-defense, is especially striking in light of the fact that the Declarations of Rights of Pennsylvania and Vermont did expressly protect such civilian uses at the time. Article XIII of Pennsylvania’s 1776 Declaration of Rights announced that “the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the state,” 1 Schwartz 266 (emphasis added); §43 of the Declaration assured that “the inhabi­ tants of this state shall have the liberty to fowl and hunt in seasonable times on the lands they hold, and on all other lands therein not inclosed,” id., at 274. And Article XV of the 1777 Vermont Declaration of Rights guaranteed “[t]hat the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the State.” Id., at 324 (emphasis added). The contrast between those two declarations and the Second Amendment reinforces the clear statement of purpose announced in the Amendment’s preamble. It confirms that the Framers’ single-minded focus in crafting the constitutional guarantee “to keep and bear arms” was on military uses of firearms, which they viewed in the context of service in state militias... [Full Text Available] Similarly, the words “the people” in the Second Amendment refer back to the object announced in the Amend­ ment’s preamble. They remind us that it is the collective action of individuals having a duty to serve in the militia that the text directly protects and, perhaps more impor­ tantly, that the ultimate purpose of the Amendment was to protect the States’ share of the divided sovereignty created by the Constitution. As used in the Fourth Amendment, “the people” describes the class of persons protected from unreasonable searches and seizures by Government officials. It is true that the Fourth Amendment describes a right that need not be exercised in any collective sense. But that observation does not settle the meaning of the phrase “the people” when used in the Second Amendment. For, as we have seen, the phrase means something quite different in the Petition and Assembly Clauses of the First Amendment. Although the abstract definition of the phrase “the people” could carry the same meaning in the Second Amendment as in the Fourth Amendment, the preamble of the Second Amendment suggests that the uses of the phrase in the First and Second Amendments are the same in referring to a collective activity. By way of contrast, the Fourth Amendment describes a right against governmental inter­ ference rather than an affirmative right to engage in protected conduct, and so refers to a right to protect a purely individual interest. As used in the Second Amendment, the words “the people” do not enlarge the right to keep and bear arms to encompass use or ownership of weapons outside the context of service in a well-regulated militia.

**2. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution** [“The Bill of Rights: A Transcription,” National Archives. The Charters of Freedom. <http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html>] **states:**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

**An individual right to handgun possession kills the Fourth Amendment. *Terry v. Ohio* proves- it encourages the government to search individuals without probable cause. Dery** [“UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: THE SUPREME COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA V. HELLER COULD WATER-DOWN FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS,” GEORGE M. DERY III, Professor, California State University Fullerton, Division of Politics, Administration, and Justice; former Deputy District Attorney, Los Angeles. California; J.D. 1987, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles; B.A. 1983, University of California Los Angeles. 2009 – 2010 13 U. Pa. J.L. & Soc. Change 1]

The idea, expressed in *Heller*, that expanding one right promotes freedom in general might be too simplistic. A nation of individuals with access to firearms does indeed put[s] government officials on notice, but the resulting consequences [and] may lead to gradual limitations on freedom. Specifically, the impact on individual rights when a government is dealing with a potentially armed populace [This] was dramatically illustrated in the seminal Fourth Amendment case, *Terry v. Ohio*.  In *Terry*, on Halloween in 1963, Cleveland Police Detective Martin McFadden noticed two men, Chilton and Terry, behaving very peculiarly, which caused him to suspect that the men were planning "a stick up" of a store.  Fearing that "they might have a gun," Officer McFadden approached the two men, identified himself, and asked for their names. [n86](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n86) When the men "mumbled" their responses, McFadden spun Terry around, patted down the outside of his  clothing, felt a pistol, and ultimately recovered from his breast pocket a .38 caliber revolver.  The facts in *Terry* presented the Court with "difficult and troublesome issues" concerning a "sensitive area of police activity"--the stop and frisk. [n88](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n88) On the one hand, Chief Justice Warren, writing for the Court, emphasized that the Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable search and seizure was an "inestimable right of personal security" that belonged "as much to the citizen of the streets of our cities as to the homeowner closeted in his study." [n89](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n89) Specifically, the Court declared that "no right is held more sacred, or is more carefully guarded, by the common law, than the right of every individual to the possession and control of his own person...." [n90](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n90) Cognizant of the realities of police encounters with civilians on the street, the Court noted that such police activity could "exacerbate police-community tensions," [n91](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n91) because "field interrogations are a major source of friction between the police and minority groups." [n92](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n92) Chief Justice Warren considered the negative effects that street detentions might cause in the hands of an unprofessional officer, who may be motivated by "the need to maintain the power image of the beat officer, an aim sometimes accomplished by humiliating anyone who attempts to undermine police control of the streets." [n93](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n93) However, the Court in *Terry* considered, on the other hand, that "the rapidly unfolding and often dangerous situations on city streets" required giving police "an escalating set of flexible responses" [n94](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n94) to ensure their safety. Chief Justice Warren recognized that officers performing field detentions have an interest more immediate and fundamental than the investigation of crime: the interest in surviving the encounter. [n95](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n95)The Court  [\*15]  stated, "American criminals have a long tradition of armed violence, and every year in this country many law enforcement officers are killed in the line of duty, and thousands more are wounded."[n96](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n96) The Court made an explicit connection between guns and officer fatalities, specifying that "[f]ifty-five of the 57 officers killed in 1966 died from gunshot wounds, 41 of them inflicted by handguns easily secreted about the person." [n97](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n97) The Court continued, "[t]he easy availability of firearms to potential criminals in this country is well known and has provoked much debate." [n98](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n98) The Court then specifically linked gun violence to its ruling by declaring, "[w]hatever the merits of gun-control proposals, this fact is relevant to an assessment of the need for some form of self-protective search powers." The subsequent legal rule allowed police to perform a stop and frisk for weapons for the protection of the police officer when "he [the officer] has reason to believe that he is{they are} dealing with an armed and dangerous individual, regardless of whether {they have} he has probable cause to arrest the individual for a crime."... [Full Text Available] In sum, during the time between *Terry* and *Wilson*, the Court's focus on weapons and the potential danger of guns motivated it to water down Fourth Amendment rights during police field investigations. By repeating the trial court's assertion that without a frisk, "the answer to the police officer may be a bullet,"  the Court in *Terry* sanctioned an entirely new police right to search based on information that does not rise to probable cause. [n175](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n175) By specifically mentioning police shootings, the Court further eroded the right of civilians in three different cases: *Adams,**[n176](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n176) Long*, [n177](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n177) and *Mimms*. [n178](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n178) Ultimately, under*Wilson*, passengers who have done nothing wrong may fall under police authority; police officers maintain "unquestioned command of the situation" for no reason other than to minimize "[t]he risk of harm to both the police and the occupants." [n179](http://www.lexisnexis.com.shs-13.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us:2048/us/lnlib/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1338320848540&returnToKey=20_T14810722646&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.169005.80515853624" \l "n179) The threat of weapons, particularly firearms, has caused the Court to gradually erode Fourth Amendment protection against stop and frisks. Such a dynamic may only worsen with the advent of the Second Amendment as an individual right separate from militia service. The Court's decision in *Heller* has limited certain government regulation of guns by explicitly making certain policy choices unavailable once a constitutional right is recognized.  The resulting increase in law enforcement's exposure to firearms may compel the Court to grant broader stop and frisk rights in order to preserve the lives of officers.

### AT Iran Deal

### A2 Lib NC

**3. TURN- A handgun ban eliminates the need for self defense, solving the root cause of the rights violation. Dixon** **93** Nicholas Dixon (associate professor of philosophy, Alma College). “Why We Should Ban Handguns In The United States.” Saint Louis University Law Review. 1993. [Premier, Premier Debate Today, Sign-Up Now]

More generally, a substantial number of the **crimes** of the kind **that** Kleck alleges **are prevented by the defensive use of firearms are** themselves **committed with guns** (64.1% of homicides, 36.6% of robberies, and 23.1% of aggravated assaults.)"' Even if Kleck is right that a ban on handguns would reduce people's ability to defend themselves, it would also reduce the need for self-defense in the first place **.** A heavily-armed citizenry might be a rational response if heavily-armed criminals were inevitable; but far more rational would be a society that strives to **disarm all private citizens**, thus **obviating the need to use firearms in self defense** . The reasoning that seeks safety in the profileration of privately owned firearms" is precisely the rationale that supported nuclear proliferation under the strategy of mutual assured destruction (MAD). This policy rested the survival of the human race on the hope that mutual fear of retaliation would prevent a first strike. It has been heavily criticized on the ground that an unspeakable catastrophe could follow an accidental firing of a nuclear missile, or a deliberate attack by a fanatical nation that did not care about retaliation. These criticisms parallel those that I have levelled at the argument for handguns as self-defense, with the difference that lethal accidents with and aggressive abuse of handguns are an everyday reality, rather than a feared possibility. A further parallel is that the high rate of handgun ownership in this country is self-perpetuating. First, it **is in response to the proliferation of handguns that** an increasing number of **people** believe they **need** to buy **a handgun for self defense** (though, as I have argued, it is an illusion that more widespread ownership of guns will decrease gun crime.) Second, while some potential **criminals** may be deterred by a heavilyarmed citizenry, others **will arm themselves with more** and more **powerful firearms** in order to outgun resisters**.** Trading gunfire or playing chicken with increasingly heavily-armed criminals is a tenuous basis for the defense of society.

4. Taking away handguns does not violate the right to self defense- there are other mechanisms to defend oneself. Your evidence assumes the handguns are the only mechanism for self defense. Dixon 2:

**Taking handguns** **from** law-abiding **citizens does not deprive them of** many methods of **selfdefense.** **They still have the option of escaping** **or calling for help**, **using weapons other than handguns, using their bare hands, reasoning with the criminal, or** simply **not resisting (which**, as I pointed out above, **is the** next **best way to avoid being injured**.)It is possible that in some cases a victim would have been able to avoid theft, injury, or even death had she been armed with a handgun. This "cost" of my proposal needs to be weighed against the likely negative results of the defensive use of handguns described above: unnecessary and excessive use of handguns in self-defense; and the deaths shown by Kellermann and Reay to result from the abuse of handguns in the home.

### Race Offense

**Right to carry laws are based on southern legal precedent developed during the 1800s to continue pacification of slaves. Evoking legal precedent evokes a racist history. Cornell and Ruben:**

Saul Cornell and Eric M. Ruben, xx-xx-xxxx, "The Slave-State Origins of Modern Gun Rights," Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/09/the-origins-of-public-carry-jurisprudence-in-the-slave-south/407809/

Gun-rights advocates have waged a relentless battle to gut what remains of America’s lax and inadequate gun regulations. In the name of the Second Amendment, they are challenging the constitutionality of state and municipal “may issue” regulations that restrict the right to carry weapons in public to persons who can show a compelling need to be armed. A few courts are starting to take these challenges seriously. But what the advocates do not acknowledge—and some courts seem not to understand—is that their arguments are grounded in precedent unique to the violent world of the slaveholding South. Claims that “may issue” regulations are unconstitutional have been rejected by most federal appellate courts—that is, until last year, when a court in California broke ranks and struck down San Diego’s public-carry regulation. This year, a court did the same with the District of Columbia’s rewritten handgun ordinance. Both decisions face further review from appellate courts, and perhaps also by the Supreme Court. If the justices buy this expansive view of the Second Amendment, laws in states such as New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Hawaii with the strictest public carry regulations—and some of the lowest rates of gun homicide—will be voided as unconstitutional. Public-carry advocates like to cite historical court opinions to support their constitutional vision, but those opinions are, to put it mildly, highly problematic. The supportive precedent they rely on comes from the antebellum South and represented less a national consensus than a regional exception rooted in the unique culture of slavery and honor. By focusing only on sympathetic precedent, and ignoring the national picture, gun-rights advocates find themselves venerating a moment at which slavery, honor, violence, and the public carrying of weapons were intertwined. As early as 1840, antebellum historian Richard Hildreth observed that violence was frequently employed in the South both to subordinate slaves and to intimidate abolitionists. In the South, violence also was an approved way to avenge perceived insults to manhood and personal status. According to Hildreth, duels “appear but once an age” in the North, but “are of frequent and almost daily occurrence at the [S]outh.” Southern men thus carried weapons both “as a protection against the slaves” and also to be prepared for “quarrels between freemen.” Two of the most feared public-carry weapons in pre-Civil War America, the “Arkansas toothpick” and “Bowie knife,” were forged from this Southern heritage. The slave South’s enthusiasm for public carry influenced its legal culture. During the antebellum years, many viewed carrying a concealed weapon as dastardly and dishonorable—a striking contrast with the values of the modern gun-rights movement. In an 1850 opinion, the Louisiana Supreme Court explained that carrying a concealed weapon gave men “secret advantages” and led to “unmanly assassinations,” while open carry “place[d] men upon an equality” and “incite[d] men to a manly and noble defence of themselves.” Some Southern legislatures, accordingly, passed laws permitting open carry but punishing concealment. Southern courts followed their lead, proclaiming a robust right to open carry, but opposing concealed carry, which they deemed unmanly and not constitutionally protected. It is this family of Southern cases that gun-rights advocates would like modern courts to rely on to strike down popularly enacted gun regulations today. But no similar record of court cases exists for the pre-Civil War North. New research produced in response to Heller has revealed a history of gun regulation outside the South that has gone largely unexplored by judges and legal scholars writing about the Second Amendment during the last 30 years. This history reveals strong support for strict regulation of carrying arms in public. In the North, publicly carrying concealable weapons was much less popular than in the South. In 1845, New York jurist William Jay contrasted “those portions of our country where it is supposed essential to personal safety to go armed with pistols and bowie-knives” with the “north and east, where we are unprovided with such facilities for taking life.” Indeed, public-carry restrictions were embraced across the region. In 1836, the respected Massachusetts jurist Peter Oxenbridge Thacher instructed a jury that in Massachusetts “no person may go armed with a dirk, dagger, sword, pistol, or other offensive and dangerous weapon, without reasonable cause to apprehend an assault or violence to his person, family, or property.” Judge Thacher’s charge was celebrated in the contemporary press as “sensible,” “practical,” and “sage.” Massachusetts was not unusual in broadly restricting public carry. Wisconsin, Maine, Michigan, Virginia, Minnesota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania passed laws modeled on the public-carry restriction in Massachusetts. This legal scheme of restricting public carry, it turns out, was not new. Rather, it was rooted in a longstanding tradition of regulating armed travel that dated back to 14th-century England. The English Statute of Northampton prohibited traveling armed “by night [or] by day, in [f]airs, [m]arkets, ... the presence of the [j]ustices or other [m]inisters” or any “part elsewhere.” Early legal commentators in America noted that this English restriction was incorporated into colonial law. As early as 1682, for example, New Jersey constables pledged to arrest any person who “shall ride or go arm’d offensively.” To be sure, there were circumstances where traveling armed was permitted, such as going to muster as part of one’s militia service or hunting in select areas, but the right of states and localities to regulate the public carrying of firearms, particularly in populated places, was undeniable. Today, Americans disagree about the best way to enhance public safety and reduce crime, and that disagreement is voiced in legislatures across the nation. Throughout most of the country and over most of its history, the Second Amendment has not determined the outcome of this debate nor stood in the way of popular public-carry regulations. Then, as now, such regulations were evaluated based on the impact they would have on crime and public safety. At the end of this deadly summer, the debate rages on over how best to balance public safety against the interests of people who wish to “pack heat.” If elected officials decide to restrict the right to carry to those persons who can demonstrate a clear need for a gun, present-day judges should not intervene on the basis of opinions about the right to bear arms from the slave South and its unique culture of violence.

**Their history arguments are flawed—gun control existed long before reconstruction. The US legal system being anti-black 150 years ago does not mean every single policy was designed for that purpose. Everitt 10:**

Ladd Everitt, 9-16-2010, "Debunking the 'gun control is racist' smear ," Waging Nonviolence, http://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/debunking-the-gun-control-is-racist-smear/

For starters, the “gun control is racist” argument, working from the McDonald decision, makes the assumption that there was no gun control before the Reconstruction period. Nothing could be further from the truth. As Justice John Paul Stevens noted in his dissent in McDonald: From the early days of the Republic, through the Reconstruction era, to the present day, States and municipalities have placed extensive licensing requirements on firearm acquisition, restricted the public carriage of weapons, and banned altogether the possession of especially dangerous weapons, including handguns … After the 1860’s just as before, the state courts almost uniformly upheld these measures. These laws were enacted to provide for the public’s safety, not to discriminate against any particular minority, and were enforced uniformly against all state residents. Additionally, regarding the argument that the 14th Amendment was somehow focused on gun rights, Stevens was not persuaded: Consider, for example, that the text of the Fourteenth Amendment says nothing about the Second Amendment or firearms; that there is substantial evidence to suggest that, when the Reconstruction Congress enacted measures to ensure newly freed slaves and Union sympathizers in the South enjoyed the right to possess firearms, it was motivated by antidiscrimination and equality concerns rather than arms-bearing concerns per se … Apart from making clear that all regulations had to be constructed and applied in a nondiscriminatory manner, the Fourteenth Amendment hardly made a dent. This is not to say that there were not discriminatory gun control laws at this time—and other times—in our history that specifically targeted blacks. But the fact is that for most of our 234 years, the entire U.S. legal system has been arrayed against blacks. Using gun rights activists’ weak logic, one could claim that virtually any type of law has racist origins: property laws, marriage laws, tort laws, contract laws, etc., etc. Just because there was once racial inequity in certain, long-abolished laws, however, does not mean we should abandon all efforts at government regulation.

You say that gun control will be enforced in a racist way but I do not have to defend racist implementation. Obviously the buyback that I advocate does not require making judgments about people so there’s no chance of bias.

### Kant Offense

I contend that your humanity is an inalienable right, so the intention to kill is never permissible. No particular action you take, which manifests a particular way of valuing the world, can imply that you forfeit the condition of valuing things, your humanity itself.  **Herman**[1] 2

Self-defense is particularly difficult in Kantian ethics, for it is not clear how one could ever be morally justified in taking someone's life. How could killing an aggressor  [is not] be compatible with the regard we must have for him as a rational agent? The fact that an aggressor acts on impermissible maxims could not justify withdrawing from him the value or moral standing he has independent of what he does. Insofar as he is no less a rational agent for being an aggressor, his continued existence instead of mine seems, from the point of view of rational agency per se, equivalent. If we follows this line of thought, no act of violence could be morally justified.

Even killing in the case of self-defense is prohibited. **Kerstein [bracketed for clarity]**

Samuel J. Kerstein, “Death, Dignity, and Respect” [http://faculty.philosophy.umd.edu/SKerstein/deathdignityandrespectstp.pdf](http://faculty.philosophy.umd.edu/SKerstein/deathdignityandrespectstp.pdf" \t "_blank) JN

It is a commonplace to hold that killing another in self-defense is, in some circumstances, morally permissible.39 Consider the following case: A law-abiding journalist has discovered widespread financial improprieties in a large company. He has a well-grounded suspicion that a security officer employed by this company aims to kill him in order to keep him from revealing what he knows. The officer follows him into an enclosed alley and approaches him with knife raised. The journalist tries, to no avail, to reason with him. He then takes out a gun and yells at the officer to stop. But he continues to move forward, now just a step away. The journalist reflects in a flash that the officer is a former paramilitary soldier and an expert in hand-to-hand combat. He concludes, very reasonably, that if he doesn’t shoot to kill, he is very unlikely to escape from the situation alive. If the journalist intentionally kills [an]the officer in this case, he acts in self-defense and his action is morally permissible, or so many of us believe.40 But in shooting and killing the officer, the journalist would not express respect for the value of [her] his humanity. (This claim is an intermediate premise in Wood’s sense.) According to Kant, humanity has dignity: it is unconditionally and incomparably valuable. Since humanity’s value is unconditional, what a person does cannot diminish its goodness; since humanity’s value is incomparable, it cannot be outweighed by the value of anything else. The journalist’s action of destroying the officer’s humanity fails to express respect for the very special value it possesses. In order to see this, consider first a case of intentionally killing (and thus destroying the humanity of) an innocent, nonthreatening person who wishes to remain alive. Doing so would express disrespect for the value of her humanity. It would convey a message that her humanity falls short of having unconditional and incomparable value. But now note that the value of the security officer’s humanity neither disappears nor at all diminishes when he acts as a malicious aggressor. That it maintains its full value is just part of what it means to say that it has unconditional value in the Kantian sense. In destroying the officer’s humanity, the journalist is destroying something no less valuable than the humanity of an innocent, nonthreatening person. If someone’s killing the innocent person expresses disrespect for the value of her humanity, then the journalist’s killing the officer expresses disrespect for the value of his. So, according to the respect-expression view, the journalist’s shooting and killing the officer in self-defense is morally impermissible.41

Second, allowing individual the ability to use self-defense or violate others without the adjudication of an impartial arbiter creates incompatible rights and leads to the state of nature.  Ripstein 2[2]

Kant’s discussion of conflict between states turns entirely on the right to engage in defensive war. Like [If] individuals outside of a rightful condition, each state is [are] only entitled, as a matter of right, to use defensive force against what it takes [they take] to be an aggressor. If that entitlement is to be part of a system of entitlements that could in principle be enjoyed by everyone together, it must, like other cases of defensive force, be subject to an objective standard; the issue of whether a particular use of defensive force is reasonable cannot be set unilaterally by either of the parties to a dispute. Neither has any claim of right to engage in acts of aggression against another. Each has only the right to defend itself, and, in determining whether to exercise this right, can only do what seems good and right to it. Since different things might seem good and right to different states, two states might each be entitled to act on the assumption that the other threatens it. The problem is not that states will engage in aggression and claim self-defense, but that even if they act in good faith, their respective rights to self-defense may not be consistent.

And, individuals should not have the unilateral ability to hinder a hindrance. This requires banning guns.

(­­\_\_)This isn’t saying that you can’t use self defense at all, but that the state has to be able to punish the victim. The state needs to be able to use its own authority in the situation to restore judicial balance

### A2 PICs

### A2 Must Defend Fed

1. Interpretation: I may defend a plan text enacted by the 50 states and Washington, D.C. if the only other thing that the aff specifies is a method of implementation and I read a util framework.
2. Standards:
   1. Solves the majority of your offense: It’s a generic util aff- you still have access to all your ground. If the states cp is a legitimate negative advocacy then you should have turns ready for when you affirm: you can just read those.
   2. Abuse is self imposed- you didn’t have to read a federal cp and shift the debate there, you could just have read your generic positions and the debate would have proceeded as normal.
   3. Real world education: Gun control is constitutionally determined by the states.

Santos 13:

**Michael De Los Santos January 14, 2013**

**(Gun Control Facts: The Commerce Clause Makes Gun Control a State Question. Policy.Mic.** [**http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg**](http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg)**)**

As President Obama weighs using [an executive order](http://mic.com/articles/22390/obama-may-make-executive-order-on-gun-control-cutting-out-congress) to enact gun control, the question of constitutionality has erupted. The Constitution lays out a specified power structure of the federal government and its relationship to the powers of states. As a result, debates often spark regarding whether something is a state’s right issue or instead under the power of the federal government. The gun rights and gun control issue has become a hot topic in relation to the Constitution. The Constitution protects the rights of private citizens to bear arms, but is the regulation of these arms a state or federal issue? Under the structure of powers within the Constitution, **the regulation of gun sales should be left to the states** with the federal government maintaining its role of regulating interstate commerce. The New York Times takes up this issue with an [article discussing](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/14/us/colorado-may-pass-major-gun-control-legislation.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0) the potential gun laws which could happen this year. Colorado has been home to two of the worst gun massacres in recent memory (Columbine and Aurora) and could serve as a crucial state in the gun control fight. The article looks at the climate in Colorado and state legislatures across the country who are wrestling with the issue. In Wyoming, they are considering a measure that would block any new federal regulation, putting the state versus federal rights squarely in the cross-hairs. The Constitution protects the right to bear arms, but what is mostly being discussed is not the right to bear arms, rather the access to those arms. As both state and federal governments look to regulate the selling of firearms, both will look to the Constitution to support whose right it actually is. Since the regulation of firearm sales are the base of the discussions, they both may look at the [Commerce Clause](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/commerce_clause) within the Constitution. This clause gives the federal government the right to regulate interstate commerce, but maintains **the states right to regulate commerce within its borders**. This is the same system which brought the national highway system. Under this clause, states can [make the argument](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/93-1260.ZO.html) **that regulating the sale of firearms within their borders is the right of the state under the Constitution**. Both state and federal governments will continue to look to regulate the sale of firearms. They both will attempt to use the Constitution as a basis for their right to regulate this industry. However, when we look at the Commerce Clause of the Constitution it appears that the right to regulate commerce within their borders makes this a state’s rights issue**. The role of the federal government is to regulate interstate commerce, and therefore should leave the gun control debate to the states** and focus their efforts on the interstate sales of this industry.

Means that it kills real world education to pretend that the fed has the power to regulate gun sales. Also kills my ground since obviously the fed can’t implement this policy.

Cross apply their voters.

### A2 Multi-Actor Fiat Bad

You bite: You fiat that all of Congress, the president, etc will all act; that’s multiple actors.

1. Interpretation: The aff may fiat action taken by the 50 states and Washington, D.C. on the Jan/Feb 2016 topic.
2. Standards:
3. Real world education: Gun control is constitutionally determined by the states.

Santos 13:

**Michael De Los Santos January 14, 2013**

**(Gun Control Facts: The Commerce Clause Makes Gun Control a State Question. Policy.Mic.** [**http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg**](http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg)**)**

As President Obama weighs using [an executive order](http://mic.com/articles/22390/obama-may-make-executive-order-on-gun-control-cutting-out-congress) to enact gun control, the question of constitutionality has erupted. The Constitution lays out a specified power structure of the federal government and its relationship to the powers of states. As a result, debates often spark regarding whether something is a state’s right issue or instead under the power of the federal government. **The gun rights and gun control issue has become a hot topic in relation to the Constitution.** The Constitution protects the rights of private citizens to bear arms, but **is the regulation of these arms a state or federal issue?** Under the structure of powers within the Constitution, **the regulation of gun sales should be left to the states** with the federal government maintaining its role of regulating interstate commerce. The New York Times takes up this issue with an [article discussing](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/14/us/colorado-may-pass-major-gun-control-legislation.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0) the potential gun laws which could happen this year. Colorado has been home to two of the worst gun massacres in recent memory (Columbine and Aurora) and could serve as a crucial state in the gun control fight. The article looks at the climate in Colorado and state legislatures across the country who are wrestling with the issue. In Wyoming, they are considering a measure that would block any new federal regulation, putting the state versus federal rights squarely in the cross-hairs. The Constitution protects the right to bear arms, but what is mostly being discussed is not the right to bear arms, rather the access to those arms. As both state and federal governments look to regulate the selling of firearms, both will look to the Constitution to support whose right it actually is. Since the regulation of firearm sales are the base of the discussions, they both may look at the [Commerce Clause](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/commerce_clause) within the Constitution. This clause gives the federal government the right to regulate interstate commerce, but maintains **the states right to regulate commerce within its borders**. This is the same system which brought the national highway system. Under this clause, states can [make the argument](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/93-1260.ZO.html) **that regulating the sale of firearms within their borders is the right of the state under the Constitution**. Both state and federal governments will continue to look to regulate the sale of firearms. They both will attempt to use the Constitution as a basis for their right to regulate this industry. However, when we look at the Commerce Clause of the Constitution it appears that the right to regulate commerce within their borders makes this a state’s rights issue**. The role of the federal government is to regulate interstate commerce, and therefore should leave the gun control debate to the states** and focus their efforts on the interstate sales of this industry.

Means that it kills real world education to pretend that the fed has the power to regulate gun sales. Also kills my ground since obviously the fed can’t implement this policy.

1. No education loss: I didn’t read a federalism advantage in the aff so the only way the debate would center around that is if you choose to read a federal cp in which case that’s your fault not mine. The debate will literally proceed as usual except the plan text was slightly different.
2. Strategy skew: If I didn’t read a states aff you could just read a state cp which moots the entirety of the aff, killing any kind of topic education and forces the debate to the same boring federalism DA’s.
3. Ground: You now have access to way more DA’s since each actor becomes something you can read DA’s and turns to.
4. No abuse since the 50 states are functionally acting as one actor- so I don’t bite your multi actor fiat bad offense.

Cross apply their voters.

### A2 Black Market

1. The black market relies on a legal supply of handguns- only I solve the root cause. Dixon 93:

WHY WE SHOULD BAN HANDGUNS IN THE UNITED STATES NICHOLAS DIXON Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan. Citation: 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243 1993

Another reason why a general ban is preferable to a targeted restriction is that, **by** virtue of **reducing the overall "pool" of guns**, **it will reduce the real number of guns in the hands of criminals**, even if it does increase the percentage of gun owners who are felons. **The illegal means by which criminals** would have to **obtain guns**-for **instance buying them from unlicensed pawnbrokers,** illegal transfers, buying them from friends who originally bought them legally, and outright theft-**are** **all dependent on the presence of** a substantial supply of **legally purchased handguns** on the market. **My proposal** **would shrink this supply**, **and** hence make it increasingly difficult for criminals to obtain handguns. It would also help to **keep guns out of the hands of lawbreakers who have** so far **eluded conviction**, and would hence qualify for gun ownership under a "targeted" ban.

1. You have conceded solvency evidence from the AC which means that there’s no impact to a black market. Even if a black market forms, total homicide went down following a gun ban so it’s still effective.
2. Your argument is derived from flawed logic and is a reason that all laws are bad- I cause a marginal reduction in guns even if there is some increase in black market activity.

AR 13:

**Armed with Reason August 2, 2013**

(REBUTTING THE ‘CRIMINALS DON’T FOLLOW LAWS’ AND ‘GUN CONTROL ONLY HURTS LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS’ ARGUMENT AGAINST GUN CONTROL. Armed With Reason.com <http://www.armedwithreason.com/rebutting-the-criminals-dont-follow-laws-and-gun-control-only-hurts-law-abiding-citizens-argument-against-gun-control/>)

What do these two graphs have in common? They both show sharp decreases in the observed rates of firearm deaths immediately following the implementation of gun reform in two countries. There is no way to reconcile this stark empirical reality with the argument that “criminals don’t obey laws.” Clearly, **some criminals obey some laws** some of the time; this is the nature of incentive explicit in law enforcement. Even at the margins, this is valuable. Indeed, J. Ludwig [empirically validated](http://home.uchicago.edu/~ludwigj/papers/CPP-EvalPolicyEval-2003.pdf) this effect in his scholarly paper about gun control and violence: “**even imperfect efforts to restrict gun availability** to high-risk people can **reduce illegal gun use** on the margin, even if these regulatory barriers can be overcome in a number of ways by those who are determined to obtain a gun.” We have one of two mechanismsto explain the decrease in violent crime following gun control: either potential **criminals are deterred from crime**, or existing criminals are deterred from crime. Either way, you have gun reform that has produced meaningful, substantive improvements in the metrics society should care about. If it’s not clear that **laws** have the capacity to **induce changes in behavior**, I won’t be able to improve upon that position. The Lawbreaker Paradox **The statement that “criminals do not follow laws”** **is** true for the same reason it’s completely irrelevant to a substantive discussion on gun reform– it’s **a tautology**. It says exactly nothing about the proper course of action a society should take to improve social outcomes. Definitionally, criminals don’t follow laws. This is no more a meaningful statement about social realities than the observation that dogs bark or cats meow, so it is baffling that gun proponents view this as an acceptable rejoinder in political debate. Though it may seem like such an obvious point may not need mentioning, it has become increasingly popular among those who oppose gun reform to argue that such legislation only hurts law-abiding citizens, making it more difficult for innocent civilians to get the guns they need to defend themselves. Criminals, after all, don’t obey the laws that burden law-abiding citizens. I will term this position the lawbreaker paradox—a paradox because it axiomatically reinforces the idea that laws, though created with the intent to improve social outcomes, hurt the people who follow them. The paradox is as follows: Law-abiding citizens obey the law Criminals are lawbreakers, and thus do not obey the law Laws impose restrictions on the behavior of only those that follow them Laws, therefore, only hurt law-abiding citizens Without exception, **every law could be refuted** with the lawbreaker’s paradox, **and societies would** swiftly **descend into anarchy** if it weren’t for reasonable policymakers. **Laws against rape, murder, and theft**, for example, **are rarely followed by rapists, murderers, and thieves**, **but the fact that such people exist in society is the reason behind such regulations in the first place.** Among gun advocates forwarding this line of argument, there seems to be a serious lapse in moral intuition that privileges expediency over human lives. To think that the minor inconvenience of gun reforms such as background checks, waiting periods, and assault weapon bans is more burdensome than the death of thousands of innocent civilians each year (which such reforms seek to redress) reflects a miscalibrated sense of what matters in the world. After all, when gun advocates say that they are being ‘hurt’ by gun control, let’s be clear what the actual implication of this statement is: my right to not be bothered in the least by regulation outweighs the right to life for thousands of innocents who die in the absence of said regulation. Not only can such gun reforms reduce the number of homicides, but there is very little controversy about the tremendous effect they would have at [reducing suicides](http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2013/03/suicides-vs-handgun-background-checks). So, the belief that laws aimed at saving lives “hurt law-abiding citizens” is completely incompatible with any sane definition of right and wrong. Why have any laws at all? Not only is this conservative sound-bite irrelevant to gun reform discussion, it’s also socially untenable and dangerously naïve. If we were to accept that a law is justified only if it has a 100% compliance rate (this is, necessarily, the logical extension of any position that renounces legal reform under the pretense that ‘criminals don’t obey laws’), then we could systematically dismantle every existing law until nothing remains but the state of nature. Laws against murder, rape, and theft would be abandoned out of fear that criminals wouldn’t follow them, and that they would thus hurt law-abiding citizens who ostensibly murder, rape, and thieve out of self-defense. Taking this argument to its logical endpoint, even the most hardened of libertarians would be reticent to accept a world where property crimes can be used to abrogate property rights. Not to mention that there are already plenty of weapons that have been banned which criminals aren’t using– RPGs, machine guns, anti-tank weapons, surface-to-air missiles, and so on. **Just because something is illegal doesn’t mean that criminals automatically have** a desire to use said weapons, or **have access to a black market** that could supply them.

### A2 Substitution

1. Cross apply Dixon, handguns are the most lethal and concealable so substitution is unlikely.
2. **Long guns won’t be used—no concealment. Dixon 93:**

WHY WE SHOULD BAN HANDGUNS IN THE UNITED STATES NICHOLAS DIXON Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan. Citation: 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243 1993

Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homicides is that **long guns are** obviously much more **difficult to conceal**. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, **a bank robber carrying a long gun will be immediately detected** by security guards, alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful robbery greatly diminished. **Handguns are** obviously much **more convenient** for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson point out that most homicides occur in the home, where concealability is "irrelevant." 95 However, **concealability would seem to be an important factor even in the home.** Since **the victim may** well **be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon**, **the "surprise factor"** which is peculiar to handguns **can still apply** even in the home. In contrast, **people can hardly be unaware** **that the person** they are with **is carrying a shotgun or rifle.** Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, **the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes** such **arguments more likely to spill over into murder**. In contrast, **by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it**, **the** potential **victim has crucial seconds** in which **to escape.**

3. You have conceded AC solvency evidence- even if people substitute, overall homicide goes down following gun bans meaning that I still solve. No impact to substitution.

### Solvency Advocates

**Law Center to Prevent G un Violence 2015**

**(Search Gun Laws by State.** [**http://smartgunlaws.org/search-gun-law-by-state/**](http://smartgunlaws.org/search-gun-law-by-state/)**)**

**Because** our **federal gun laws are** so **weak**, **states can play a critical role by adopting laws to protect communities from gun violence**. While some **states** have enacted a number of strong laws, others **have far too** **few** laws **on the books**. Learn about the gun laws in every state, or see how your state compares to others across the country.

**Michael De Los Santos January 14, 2013**

**(Gun Control Facts: The Commerce Clause Makes Gun Control a State Question. Policy.Mic.** [**http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg**](http://mic.com/articles/22853/gun-control-facts-the-commerce-clause-makes-gun-control-a-state-question#.3WatG1Fcg)**)**

As President Obama weighs using [an executive order](http://mic.com/articles/22390/obama-may-make-executive-order-on-gun-control-cutting-out-congress) to enact gun control, the question of constitutionality has erupted. The Constitution lays out a specified power structure of the federal government and its relationship to the powers of states. As a result, debates often spark regarding whether something is a state’s right issue or instead under the power of the federal government. **The gun rights and gun control issue has become a hot topic in relation to the Constitution.** The Constitution protects the rights of private citizens to bear arms, but **is the regulation of these arms a state or federal issue?** Under the structure of powers within the Constitution, **the regulation of gun sales should be left to the states** with the federal government maintaining its role of regulating interstate commerce. The New York Times takes up this issue with an [article discussing](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/14/us/colorado-may-pass-major-gun-control-legislation.html?pagewanted=1&_r=0) the potential gun laws which could happen this year. Colorado has been home to two of the worst gun massacres in recent memory (Columbine and Aurora) and could serve as a crucial state in the gun control fight. The article looks at the climate in Colorado and state legislatures across the country who are wrestling with the issue. In Wyoming, they are considering a measure that would block any new federal regulation, putting the state versus federal rights squarely in the cross-hairs. The Constitution protects the right to bear arms, but what is mostly being discussed is not the right to bear arms, rather the access to those arms. As both state and federal governments look to regulate the selling of firearms, both will look to the Constitution to support whose right it actually is. Since the regulation of firearm sales are the base of the discussions, they both may look at the [Commerce Clause](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/commerce_clause) within the Constitution. This clause gives the federal government the right to regulate interstate commerce, but maintains **the states right to regulate commerce within its borders**. This is the same system which brought the national highway system. Under this clause, states can [make the argument](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/93-1260.ZO.html) **that regulating the sale of firearms within their borders is the right of the state under the Constitution**. Both state and federal governments will continue to look to regulate the sale of firearms. They both will attempt to use the Constitution as a basis for their right to regulate this industry. However, when we look at the Commerce Clause of the Constitution it appears that the right to regulate commerce within their borders makes this a state’s rights issue**. The role of the federal government is to regulate interstate commerce, and therefore should leave the gun control debate to the states** and focus their efforts on the interstate sales of this industry.

**Ken Klukowski March 3, 2010**

**(Supreme court Debates Whether States Can Ban Guns. Townhall.** [**http://townhall.com/columnists/kenklukowski/2010/03/03/supreme\_court\_debates\_whether\_states\_can\_ban\_guns/page/full**](http://townhall.com/columnists/kenklukowski/2010/03/03/supreme_court_debates_whether_states_can_ban_guns/page/full)**)**

On March 2, the Supreme Court heard arguments on whether the Second Amendment applies to states, or instead is only a right against the federal government. Although it looks like America’s gun owners are going to win this case—largely thanks to the National Rifle Association—there’s some big questions as to exactly how the Court is going to decide this case, and what it means for all of us. The U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments today in McDonald v. City of Chicago. It follows on the heels of the 2008 District of Columbia v. Heller decision, where by a 5-4 vote the Court struck down D.C.’s absolute ban on handguns and other readily-usable firearms. McDonald is a challenge to the Chicago gun ban, which—although not quite as severe as the ban in Heller—is nonetheless for all practical purposes a complete ban on guns, even in the home. So the question in McDonald is whether the Second Amendment right to bear arms applies to the states. When the Bill of Rights was adopted in 1791, it originally only secured rights against the federal government. When the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868 after the Civil War, it extended most—but not all—of the Bill of Rights to also apply to the states, and political units of the states, such as cities. The legal term is that the Fourteenth Amendment “incorporates” rights against the states. On March 2, the Supreme Court heard arguments on whether the Second Amendment applies to states, or instead is only a right against the federal government. Although it looks like America’s gun owners are going to win this case—largely thanks to the National Rifle Association—there’s some big questions as to exactly how the Court is going to decide this case, and what it means for all of us. The U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments today in McDonald v. City of Chicago. It follows on the heels of the 2008 District of Columbia v. Heller decision, where by a 5-4 vote the Court struck down D.C.’s absolute ban on handguns and other readily-usable firearms. McDonald is a challenge to the Chicago gun ban, which—although not quite as severe as the ban in Heller—is nonetheless for all practical purposes a complete ban on guns, even in the home. So the question in McDonald is whether the Second Amendment right to bear arms applies to the states. When the Bill of Rights was adopted in 1791, it originally only secured rights against the federal government. When the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868 after the Civil War, it extended most—but not all—of the Bill of Rights to also apply to the states, and political units of the states, such as cities. The legal term is that the Fourteenth Amendment “incorporates” rights against the states. As the federal capital city, Washington, D.C. is directly under federal law, so Heller did not involve incorporation. So incorporation is instead the question before the Court today concerning Chicago. What was so interesting in the argument today is how the pro-gun camp is split on this case. The traditional route for incorporating rights is through the Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause, which is why the NRA—which was also a party in this case—argued for this approach. But the libertarian activists arguing this case for Otis McDonald and his co-plaintiffs were instead arguing for the Court to incorporate the right to bear arms through the little-used Privileges or Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and in doing so to overrule one of the biggest Supreme Court decisions of all time, called the Slaughter-House Cases, from 1873. These activists made clear that they also support incorporation through the Due Process Clause, but devoted the vast bulk of their briefs and argument time to pushing Privileges or Immunities. (There is a third argument, that it’s possible to incorporate gun rights through the Privileges or Immunities Clause without overruling the Slaughter-House Cases, which I argued in an amicus brief filed in this case, but the Court focused on the two main arguments during the session today.) There had been months of speculation and excitement in some libertarian circles regarding the possibility of Slaughter-House being overruled, as this would open the door to all sorts of libertarian economic rights. (It should also be noted that many libertarians oppose overruling Slaughter-House.) These activists were enthusiastically joined by liberals, who see overruling the Slaughter-House Cases as the key to declaring all sorts of new constitutional rights, from government-run healthcare to environmental “rights” to abortion to same-sex marriage. But any hopes for the Privileges or Immunities Clause came crashing down during argument today. In the very first minute of argument, Chief Justice John Roberts declared that the McDonald lawyers faced a heavy burden if they meant to convince the Court to overrule a major precedent that had been on the books for 140 years, one that helps define the contours of federal-state relations under our Constitution. When the McDonald team acknowledged this would be a big step, Justice Antonin Scalia weighed in strongly against it, asking why they were pressing such an argument on the Court. Scalia correctly pointed out that using the Due Process Clause was a deeply-flawed approach (for a host of legal reasons), but that it’s the way the Court had done it for a century, so why would they want to completely overhaul how constitutional rights are incorporated to the states? Nonetheless, the McDonald team kept swinging away, trying to climb back into the box that Scalia knocked them out of by signaling that the conservative justices on the Court—the only justices that are pro-gun—were unwilling to reinvent the wheel when so much is at stake. Then the National Rifle Association took the lectern, represented by former U.S. Solicitor General Paul Clement. The NRA argued that, “incorporating the Second Amendment through the Due Process Clause is remarkably straightforward,” and urged the Court to take the conventional route. At this point the liberal justices, beginning with John Paul Stevens, tried to trip up Clement by getting him to allow that some **Supreme Court precedents suggest that even if the Second Amendment is incorporated,** that perhaps cities and **states have greater latitude in restricting guns than the federal government**. But the NRA proved that it had wisely invested its resources in retaining Clement, who is one of the most successful Supreme Court litigators alive. Clement handled all their questions without ceding any ground, running the gauntlet set up by the liberal justices without a single slip. Chicago’s lawyer then argued that the Court should not incorporate the Second Amendment through either route, and was promptly pummeled for doing so. The conservative justices clearly weren’t with him, and the Court’s usual swing vote, moderate Justice Anthony Kennedy, drove a stake through the heart of Chicago’s position by declaring that the right to keep and bear arms is a fundamental right, and that this Court must come to that conclusion unless it were to hold that the Heller decision was wrong. In other words, Kennedy was saying that unless Chicago convinced the Court to overrule its 2008 Heller decision, then Chicago was going to lose on the incorporation issue. And it was abundantly clear that the Court was not going to consider overturning Heller. Chief Justice Roberts sealed Chicago’s fate on that point, saying of Chicago’s argument, “That sounds an awful lot to me like the argument we heard in Heller on the losing side.” Then the libertarian lawyer again took the podium to offer his rebuttal arguments. As things went back to the Privileges or Immunities Clause, the conservative justices embraced the conservative argument against the McDonald team, correctly noting that overruling Slaughter-House would empower federal judges to declare all sorts of novel constitutional rights, and sit in judgment to strike down state and local laws on issues where the U.S. Constitution is silent. Such an outcome violates our federal system of government, where the states are sovereign to makes any laws they choose through the legislatures elected by their voters on every issue where the U.S. Constitution does not empower the federal government to decide them, or declare a constitutional right. So in the end, it’s almost certain that the Second Amendment will be incorporated to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, and that most or all of the justices supporting incorporation will do so through the Due Process Clause. The Chicago gun ban is about to suffer the same fate as the D.C. gun ban. There are plenty of questions, however. Will all four liberal justices oppose incorporation? Will some support incorporation, but still vote to uphold the Chicago ban? What else will be said about gun rights in the Court’s opinion that will shape future Second Amendment cases? It’s unclear from oral argument as to which way these things will come down. We’ll find out when the Supreme Court hands down its decision, which is expected in late June. But what we know already is that today was a good day for the NRA, and a great day for the Second Amendment.

**Alex Nobles July 25, 2015**

**(Obama Praises Australia’s Gun Ban. The Actual Result. Louder with Crowder.** [**http://louderwithcrowder.com/obama-praises-australias-gun-ban-the-actual-results/**](http://louderwithcrowder.com/obama-praises-australias-gun-ban-the-actual-results/)**)**

**In 1996 a** [**massacre**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2015/06/23/what-happened-after-australia-banned-lots-of-guns-after-a-massacre/) in Tasmania left 35 people dead, and **caused Australia to establish draconian gun control laws. They literally rounded up, destroyed and banned guns**. Now the rumor goes, they haven’t had any mass shootings since, and that crime has decreased as a result. HINT: not quite. Enter **Obama**, who [**said**](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/06/22/obama-gun-manufacturers-make-out-like-bandits-after-mass-shootings/)**: “When Australia had a mass killing, it was just so shocking to the system, the entire country said, ‘Well, we’re going to completely change our gun laws’, and they did. And it hasn’t happened since.**” Read more: <http://louderwithcrowder.com/obama-praises-australias-gun-ban-the-actual-results/#ixzz3upKyFRpS> Follow us: [@scrowder on Twitter](http://ec.tynt.com/b/rw?id=bX5kn417er5iQ1acwqm_6l&u=scrowder" \t "_blank) | [stevencrowderofficial on Facebook](http://ec.tynt.com/b/rf?id=bX5kn417er5iQ1acwqm_6l&u=stevencrowderofficial" \t "_blank)

#### Resolved: the United States federal government will ban private ownership of handguns by enforcing confiscation and a $500 fine on individuals in possession of handguns.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Perhaps enforcing unpopular, or at least controversial, handgun disarmament could be made easier by setting the punishment low. If illegal possession of a handgun were treated as a misdemeanor or administrative violation, punishable by a small fine, say $250 or $500, jury trials could be avoided altogether. However, under that scheme, people who were (p.165) committed to keeping their handguns would be no more deterred from violating the gun law than from violating the speed limit.

### A2 Cali Politics

You don’t have uniqueness proving that the bill will pass now- that evidence should have been in the 1N when you read the DA. You can’t just not read uniqueness and then read it in the 2N, that’s a new argument that kills aff strat since I don’t have enough time to respond to new arguments in the 2AR, so if an argument can be in the 1N it should be.

AND- the bill won’t pass, it lacks the majority necessary. Fensterwald 14:

John Fensterwald. October 7, 2014. EdSource. Education Groups Withhold Support of Rainy Day Fund. http://edsource.org/2014/education-groups-wont-back-rainy-day-fund/68216

Gov. Jerry **Brown won’t have key education groups helping him** **make the case** to voters **for a** bigger and more restrictive state **rainy day fund**. **The most** he can count on **is that they won’t actively campaign against it**. Organizations representing school district financial officers ([California Association of School Business Officials](http://www.casbo.org/" \t "_blank)) and school superintendents and principals ([Association of California School Administrators](http://www.acsa.org/" \t "_blank)) voted during the summer to officially oppose Brown’s Budget Stabilization Account, which will appear on next month’s ballot as [Proposition 2](http://www.voterguide.sos.ca.gov/en/propositions/2/" \t "_blank). And at a meeting in late September, **the board of the California School** Boards Association voted not to take a position on the proposition. That decision was actually good news for the governor, since at a press conference in May, association President Josephine Lucey vowed to push her board to fight the proposal. The states’ **two teachers unions** – the California Teachers Association and the smaller California Federation of Teachers – also **voted to go neutral on Prop**. 2. The CTA’s 700-member delegates assembly made that decision in June. Shy of majority support **Brown could use some help** to get Prop. 2 passed. A poll by the Public Policy Institute of California\*\* in September showed **voters favoring the proposition 43 to 33 percent**, still **shy of the majority needed to pass**. **A quarter of voters remain undecided**. A campaign committee formed to promote the measure has been awaiting orders from the governor and done little. The [Yes on Propositions 1 & 2 Campaign](http://www.yesonprops1and2.com/" \t "_blank) – which includes the $7 billion water bond, Brown’s other proposition – has only $3 million, but the governor is expected to spend a chunk of his own $24 million campaign fund pushing the propositions or to transfer the money to the ballot measure campaign. (Update: B[rown’s first ads for Props. 1 and 2,](http://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-pc-jerry-brown-ads-20141007-story.html" \t "_blank) two 30-second spots, went on the air today, Oct. 8.) Prop. 2, which both the Senate and Assembly passed unanimously, has [no shortage of endorsers](http://www.yesonprops1and2.com/endorsements" \t "_blank): the state Chamber of Commerce, state Republican and Democratic parties, the League of Women Voters, taxpayer groups and most of the state’s biggest newspapers.

For legislation, the general public in California votes, so if I win that Californians in general like a handgun ban, I win the round.

Californians love gun control. Richman January 12, 2016:

Josh Richman. GunDebate: Californians Support More Gun Control, Poll Finds. The Mercury News. <http://www.mercurynews.com/california/ci_29374231/gun-debate-californians-support-more-gun-control-poll>. Politics Reporter.

With the country immersed in another heated debate over guns, a new poll finds **Californians favor stricter gun control measures here** -- even though the Golden State already boasts some of the toughest firearm regulations in the nation. **A vast majority of California voters** -- including most Republicans -- **support proposals that would require background checks** to buy ammunition **and prevent people on the** government's "**no-fly" list from buying guns**, the new Field Poll shows. The poll also suggests that President Barack Obama will have a receptive audience in California when he brings up his recent executive actions on gun control in his State of the Union address Tuesday night. **Fifty-seven percent of voters** here **believe it's** more **important to impose greater controls on gun ownership** than it is to protect the rights of Americans to own guns, a priority favored by 38 percent. That's "not on par with what you're seeing nationwide, which is about an even split," said Field Poll Director Mark DiCamillo. An ABC News/Washington Post national poll in October found 47 percent see protecting gun ownership rights as a higher priority, while 46 percent said enacting new laws to try to reduce gun violence is more important. Congress has yet to see a bill seeking background checks for buying ammunition, but Republicans have refused to allow votes on bills requiring universal background checks for firearms purchases -- something California did long ago -- and barring firearm purchases by those on the "no-fly" list. But **in an unusual bipartisan show of support**, California voters are showing even greater enthusiasm than they did three years ago for one of the major proposals in a ballot measure for which Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom and his allies are collecting petition signatures. **A whopping 80 percent of California voters favor requiring background checks for ammunition** purchases, up 5 percentage points from when the Field Poll asked the question in February 2013. And 75 percent favor the "no-fly" list ban touted by Obama and congressional Democrats but opposed by many civil libertarians who say it would violate constitutional due-process rights. "Usually on things like gun control ... you expect to see big partisan differences, but on those two, we didn't," DiCamillo noted. While the same proportion of Democratic voters (90 percent) now support requiring background checks for ammunition purchases as did in February 2013, support among independent voters has jumped from 77 percent then to 88 percent now, and **support among Republicans has jumped** from 53 percent to 58 percent.

Outweighs your analytic: This is empirical evidence which matters way more on the politics debate since it’s really hard to predict which way voters will go. Also, prefer empirics over analytics in general because it’s the only way to confirm that your analytics are true- logic can be used to justify anything

California legislature likes gun control- they’ve passed 7 bills already. The only person who is hesitant on gun control is Brown himself. Klamar April 20, 2016:

Joe Klamar. 7 Gun Control Bills Are Advancing Through the California Senate. Here’s what each would do. KPCC Politics. http://www.scpr.org/news/2016/04/20/59821/7-gun-control-bills-advancing-through-the-californ/

**A California legislative panel has approved seven gun-control bills.** Democrats on the Senate Public Safety Committee voted Tuesday to require that people who make homemade guns get a background check and apply for a serial number. **Senate President** Pro Tem Kevin de Leon says **the bill would help police track guns** used in crimes. Democratic Gov. Jerry **Brown vetoed a similar measure** in 2014**. The committee** also **approved a bill that seeks to get around a court order barring enforcement of a 2009 law** requiring stores to keep records on purchases of handgun ammunition.

1. Joseph Nye (Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard, and previous dean of Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government) and Richard Armitage (13th United States Deputy Secretary of State, the second-in-command at the State Department, serving from 2001 to 2005), “CSIS Reports – A Smarter, More Secure America”, 11/6, 2007 <http://www.csis.org/component/option,com_csis_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Henry Goldman December 20, 2012

   (Shootings Costing US $174 Billion Show Burden of Gun Violence. Bloomberg. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2012-12-21/shootings-costing-u-s-174-billion-show-burden-of-gun-violence>) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Phil torres February 10, 2016

   (Biodiversity Loss and the Doomsday Clock: An Invisible Disaster Almost No One is Talking About. Common Dreams. American scientist and journalist. <http://www.commondreams.org/views/2016/02/10/biodiversity-loss-and-doomsday-clock-invisible-disaster-almost-no-one-talking-about>) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Patrick Burke February 4, 2013

   (US gun Owners Outnumbered Hunters by 5 to 1 in 2011. CBS News. <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/us-gun-owners-outnumbered-hunters-5-1-2011>) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Peter Muller Fall 2011

   (Human Hunting Destroys Our Environment. Committee to Abolish Sport Hunting. VP of CASH. <http://www.all-creatures.org/cash/cc2011-fa-destroys.html>) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)